

MAY 14 1918  
UNIV. OF MICH.  
LIBRARY

# The Classical Journal

PUBLISHED BY THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MIDDLE WEST AND SOUTH  
WITH THE CO-OPERATION OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND  
AND THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PACIFIC STATES

Volume XIII

MAY 1918

Number 8

Editorial	345
Horace on Contemporary Poetry	Tenney Frank 550
Cumae in Legend and History	Elizabeth Hazelton Haight 565
The Classics and the Greek Writers of the Early Church: Saint Basil	Roy J. Deferrari 579
Glimpses of Roman Life as It Is Revealed to Us in the Literature	Charles Christopher Mierow 591
Virgil and Apocalyptic Literature	Norman W. DeWitt 600
Did Homer Have an <i>Odyssey</i> in Mind While Composing the <i>Iliad</i> ?	John A. Scott 607
Pastoral Elements in the Greek Epigram	Charles E. Whitmore 616
Notes	
On Subjunctive Conditions	Bernard M. Allen 621
Two Corrections	622
Lincoln and Gorgias Once More	Charles N. Smiley 623
Recent Books	624

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, LONDON AND EDINBURGH  
THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO,  
FUKUOKA, SENDAI  
THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, SHANGHAI

# THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Published by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, with the co-operation  
of the Classical Association of New England and the Classical Association  
of the Pacific States

## Managing Editors

**FRANK J. MILLER**  
University of Chicago

**ARTHUR T. WALKER**  
University of Kansas

## For New England

**MONROE N. WETMORE**  
Williams College

## For the Pacific States

**HERBERT C. NUTTING**  
University of California

## Associate Editors

**GEORGE H. CHASE**  
Harvard University

**FREDERICK C. EASTMAN**  
University of Iowa

**CLARENCE W. GLEASON**  
Roxbury Latin School, Boston

**DANIEL W. LOTHMAN**  
East High School, Cleveland

**WALTER MILLER**  
University of Missouri

**JOHN A. SCOTT**  
Northwestern University

**GILBERT C. SCHOEN**  
University of Missouri

**JULIANNE A. ROLLER**  
Franklin High School, Portland, Oregon

**BERTHA GREEN**  
Hollywood High School, Los Angeles

The Classical Journal is published monthly except in July, August, and September. The subscription price is \$2.50 per year; the price of single copies is 30 cents. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Shanghai. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$2.65); on single copies 2 cents (total 32 cents). For all other countries in the Postal Union, 24 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$2.74); on single copies 3 cents (total 33 cents). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to The University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized to quote the prices indicated:

For the British Empire: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, 11s. 3d. each; single copies, including postage, 1s. 4d. each.

For Japan and Korea: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, 11 to 16 Nihonbashi Tori Sanchoe, Tokyo, Japan. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, Yen 5.50 each; single copies, including postage, Yen 0.66 each.

For China: THE MINGHON BOOK COMPANY, 18 Peking Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions \$2.50; single copies 30 cents, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra, if mailed direct outside of Shanghai, on yearly subscriptions 24 cents, on single copies 3 cents.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit. Deliveries are not guaranteed within the war zones of Europe nor in other countries where transportation is disturbed by conditions incident to war.

Business correspondence should be addressed as follows:

1. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of the Middle West and South to LOUIS E. LORR, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio. The territory of the Association includes Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming. The membership fee is \$1.00 per year to residents of this territory.

2. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of New England to MONROE N. WETMORE, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

3. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of the Pacific States to M. E. DEUTSCH, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. The territory of this association includes California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and Arizona. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

4. Concerning subscriptions (not related to membership) to THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts should be sent either to FRANK J. MILLER, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., or to ARTHUR T. WALKER, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan.; from New England contributors to MONROE N. WETMORE, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., and from the Pacific States to HERBERT C. NUTTING, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.

Fifty reprints of articles will be furnished gratis to authors. Additional copies, if ordered in advance of publication, will be supplied at cost.

# THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME XIII

MAY 1918

NUMBER 8

## Editorial

### AT OMAHA

Omaha gave us a whole-hearted welcome on the morning of the fourth of April. Even before we had settled down in her comfortable hotels we were greeted by a great arch over a central business street, bearing the words "Welcome, Classics"; this at night blazed out its message in electric light. Omaha is a hotbed of patriotism as well as a most hospitable city. Her patriotism was apparent from the first, but by Saturday, the opening day of the great drive for the Third Liberty Loan, patriotic ardor burst all bounds in the great demonstration of Saturday afternoon.

The Thursday afternoon and evening sessions were held in the handsome and convenient auditorium of the Hotel Fontenelle, headquarters of the Association. The Friday and Saturday sessions were held in the Auditorium of Central High School. The order of the printed program was followed, except that the papers of Professors Weller, Hellems, and Slaughter, owing to the inability of these gentlemen to be present, were not presented. Professors Eastman and Kelsey also were unable to be present. Their papers were read by Professors Potter and Laing.

The papers on the whole were up to the usual standard of excellence, and many of them will appear in the *Journal* during the coming year. The paper on "Latin and the Study of the Romance Languages," by Dr. C. E. Parmenter, of the Department of Romance Languages, University of Chicago, was of peculiar interest

as presented by a representative of another department, and as showing the intimate relations existing between his own and our departments. It was voted that this paper be printed simultaneously in the *Classical Journal*, in the *Modern Language Journal*, and in a third journal of a more general educational character.

The pedagogical papers centered largely around the two subjects of Latin and English derivatives, and of the readjustment of the relation between the first- and second-year Latin courses, involving also a shortening of the present reading requirements.

Members of the association were hospitably entertained at luncheon at the Chamber of Commerce, where they were welcomed by Mr. Gamble on behalf of the Chamber, and at the high school by the young women of the domestic science department.

A notable feature of the program was a reading by Mr. Witter Bynner, American poet, of his own version of *Iphigenia in Tauris*. It was agreed by all who heard this that both the version itself and its rendition by Mr. Bynner were most edifying and delightful.

But it remained for Miss Susan Paxson, of the Latin department of the Central High School, and chairman of the local committee of arrangements, to provide that part of the program which will make this meeting notable in the history of the Association. This was the presentation of Miss Paxson's new and as yet unpublished play, *Roma non delenda est*, by her own pupils. The play covers the incidents of the conspiracy of Catiline, its discovery by Cicero, and the trial and punishment of the conspirators. There was no attempt at elaboration of stage effect, although the actors were appropriately costumed in garments and accessories, for the most part home-made. The pronounced success of the play as presented was gained wholly by the freshness and charm and utter sincerity of the young actors, who threw themselves into their parts with all enthusiasm and so read their lines that those who could follow the Latin did so with delight, and those who could not could at least interpret the action understandingly. As an entertainment the play was beyond praise. As a pedagogic device, we can well believe that the students (and they were many) who participated in the play have made advances in knowledge of Latin and in enthusiasm for its study that are hard to measure. Miss Paxson and the Latin



department of Central High School are to be heartily congratulated upon the play, and deserve and have the thanks of the Association for their great contribution to the success of the whole program.

---

#### THE RECENT MEETING OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND

The thirteenth annual meeting of this Association was held at the Loomis Institute, Windsor, Connecticut, March 22 and 23. A finer place for assembling could not be desired, and the meeting was highly successful in every way. One member has briefly but well written, "I do not know when I have enjoyed the atmosphere of a meeting more. Everything seemed so harmonious and delightful." From the moment of our arrival on Thursday night, or Friday morning, to the hour of our departure on Saturday afternoon we were the guests of the school, which did everything humanly possible for our comfort and happiness. The head master, Mr. N. H. Batchelder, gave the Association a most enjoyable tea at his house on Friday afternoon, and the school authorities provided a perfect dinner that evening. It was "perfect" from our point of view as well as from Mr. Hoover's. All things done for us by the school were managed in simple and masterly fashion. For most of the members the only disturbing thought concerned the news from the Western Front.

Although we met again this year far (according to our New England terminology) from the locality most convenient for the great majority of our members, about one hundred members or guests were in attendance. In "banner years" about one hundred and twenty-five persons are present at our meetings.

The papers may be characterized, as these editorials have had the habit of doing, as excellent in scholarship, deeply interesting and valuable in content, and charming in expression and manner of presentation. Fairly long, though the secretary always asks for brief, abstracts of all the papers will be furnished in the annual *Bulletin*, while several of them will be given in full in this journal. Summaries, therefore, are not wanted here, though the writer has the abstracts and could easily quote them. Three or four of the

papers were in form and substance quite unusual. In this connection I may be allowed to mention in particular Professor Ridgeway's paper on "The Value of the Traditions Respecting the Early Kings of Rome." One purpose of the author was to show the folly of Mommsen's judgment on this subject. Nominally the paper dealt mostly with Irish traditions. Really, however, every part of the argument had a bearing upon the early history of Rome, the author's real design being to prove that there is nothing inherently improbable in the stories concerning the kings of Rome. There was nothing startlingly novel about the idea. The great interest in the paper lay in its method of attacking the problem and in its style.

At its meeting a year ago the Association voted that a committee of five members be appointed by the President "to find out what teachers of other subjects really do think about the value of the classics, and to secure the publication of these views in non-classical periodicals." Shortly after a committee with this purpose had been tentatively decided upon by the officers of the Association, and after the wording of its purpose had been fixed exactly as given above, the news came that a great conference on this subject was to be held in June at Princeton University. It may be of interest to note that the Princeton authorities gave the title *Value of the Classics* to their important volume, containing the addresses delivered at, and the opinions prepared for, this conference.

At our recent meeting the chairman of this committee presented a report showing what had been accomplished, and recommending the discharge of the committee. This report was read by the secretary, since the chairman himself was kept from attending the meeting by an attack of a kind of measles which he refused to name. The Princeton conference and its indispensable volume seem to have accomplished our object along this line, at least for the present. Our task now should be to follow Professor Nutting's example in securing the publication of timely articles in non-classical periodicals, so far as may be possible. Therefore the Association voted that this committee be "honorably discharged."

Another committee appointed a year ago was a Latin Investigation Committee. Its purpose I do not need to give, for it is

familiar to the members of all three of our Associations. Each of the three members of the New England committee presented a full report. They had done a really tremendous amount of work, and had collected facts and opinions of great value. Considerable space will be given to these reports in the *Bulletin*. Since, apparently, nothing more remained to be done along this line, the Association voted that this committee also be discharged and a new committee of three members be appointed, with a somewhat different purpose. The motion finally passed was as follows:

That a committee of three . . . be appointed by the chair to secure an adequate series of measurements of Latin and non-Latin pupils of equal standing in public high schools, private secondary schools, and colleges, for the purpose (1) of testing comparative facility in the use of English and (2) of determining how far the study has resulted in added mental power, that is, has served as a means of mental discipline. In arranging for the second part of these tests the committee shall make a preliminary report as to their plans to the Executive Committee of the Classical Association of New England, and on the approval of said committee shall carry through their plans.

(It may not be necessary to explain that the second part of the motion was added to provide against a possibly too great expenditure of the Association's funds.)

Also, it was voted to accept the cordial invitation received from President Cole to meet next year at Wheaton College, Norton, Massachusetts.

The officers elected for the coming year are: President, George E. Howes, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.; Vice-President, George H. Browne, Browne and Nichols School, Cambridge, Mass.; Secretary-Treasurer, Monroe N. Wetmore, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.; Members of the Executive Committee, Miss Minnie M. Pickering, Brimmer School, Boston, Mass.; Miss Lillian M. Sleeper, High School, Manchester, N.H.

M. N. W.

## HORACE ON CONTEMPORARY POETRY

BY TENNEY FRANK  
Bryn Mawr College

The ancient writer who, like the Elizabethans, lived before men grew all too inquisitive about sources had much cause for gratitude. He did not have to blot out lines simply because he found that someone had anticipated him; he did not keep well-read secretaries to warn him where staked claims lay. If he found a line in some predecessor that said just what he wanted, he used it—for why should he say something he did not mean simply because the right word had been pre-empted—so he could add the resources of his own imagination to those of others and create the richer pattern. The predecessor might raise some slight objection against the free use of borrowed plumage but he recked little provided the plumage was appropriate. And the scholar who is not too bent on plagiary-hunting enjoys his Milton all the more for its wealth of Vergilian associations, and his Vergil none the less for its reminiscences of Homer. In such reading the music unheard is at times even sweeter than that which is heard.

But such liberties in composition sometimes involve the scholar in puzzles, particularly when they are not used with entire legitimacy. When Pope, in imitation of Horace's famous passage,

*Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit,*

composed his perversion of English literary history into

*We conquered France, but felt our captive's charms,*

DeQuincy advisedly fell into satire. Horace himself sometimes follows his Greek predecessors so faithfully that one is tempted to doubt whether he is invariably faithful to Roman conditions. Can we rely wholly upon his history of Roman comedy, and his discussion of the satiric drama, or is he substituting Greek theory for vaguely known facts? Indeed we are sometimes at a loss to know how far to follow him.



Students have generally approached Horace's *Ars Poetica*—or rather the *Epistola ad Pisones*—from one of two points of view. The delving scholar starts out from the statement of the scholiast: "Horace has brought together not all but the chief precepts of Neoptolemus the Parian," an obscure critic who lived two centuries before Horace's time. Now, ancient scholiasts, like their modern successors, were all too fond of a source and often over-valued their finds. Who does not remember Servius' broad statement that Vergil's fourth book was modeled upon Apollonius? We who in this case possess the supposed source find a vague similarity between the two in theme only: both were love stories—and there resemblance ends. How can we be certain that the scholiast of Horace was more accurate than Servius? Be that as it may, the scholar has, and rightly enough, searched Horace's predecessors from Aristotle down for critical judgments that parallel those of Horace, and he has found a great many. The danger lies in assuming at every point that the *Ars Poetica* is a work of direct imitation in which, like Pope in the passage just quoted, Horace adhered to the logic of his original to the distortion of patent facts. Now an examination of the two other literary epistles of Horace, in which he is concerned with immediate events and in which he discloses his gospel of art, will quickly incline the reader, I believe, to the assumption that the *Ars Poetica* is in the main not a slavish reproduction of Greek originals but a hand-to-hand contest with immediate problems. Similarities with Aristotelian commonplaces can well enough be explained by the fact that the essential rules of literary art are after all so abiding that there is no opportunity for unlimited originality in stating them.

And even if Horace used his notes from Neoptolemus in enunciating general principles, these may have served him merely as guideposts. There is a certain distortion of the facts in considering a literary critic only in relation to the literary critics who have preceded him, for it blurs the essential truth that a man feels and expresses again only that part of his predecessor's work which he has himself experienced. The work of any critic could readily be glossed by copious marginalia extracted from the mass of worthies between Aristotle and Saint Beuve, but such marginalia would

hardly be relevant. After all, a man's temper and experiences, the fashions of the day which he follows or combats, his desultory reading, and his capacity for analysis—these things shape his creed, which will perforce resemble former creeds in many respects, since the field of art is limited by nature. A piece of criticism like the *Ars Poetica* then, if it be not wholly an a priori study of the cell—and Horace was never a recluse—deserves first of all to be set in its milieu among contemporary artistic movements and only secondarily in its chronological relationship to its predecessors.

Another way of approaching the *Ars Poetica* is well illustrated by Saintsbury in the first volume of his *History of Criticism*. In search for absolute values and abiding principles, he has no patience with the direct problems of Horace and with what he terms his "red tape." It does not concern him that Horace is giving advice to a rash beginner who occasionally needs the science of pruning more than the arcana of a great art more or less beyond his grasp; nor does it concern him that Horace when he wrote the work was in the midst of a fray with his contemporaries and was jousting with all the force at his command against the prevalent errors of his day. It may well be that the detached critic should occasionally withdraw from the immediate contest to outline the philosophy of his art, but in this epistle it happens that Horace took no such position. He was the leader of a propaganda rather than a generalizing sophist. He neither deserves nor asks to be regarded as a philosophic maker of the absolute rules of art. And it is as violent to read him without reference to his contemporary problems as it is to read Dante without a knowledge of and power of entering into the spirit of the mediaeval religion that permeates him.

If then Horace is of his age, for all that he has studied his predecessors well, and if he is so concerned with the problems before his eyes that he often fails to concern himself about the larger aspects of criticism, it is but fair that he should be interpreted in the light of his own problems.

Of course in such a task the reader is at once confronted with no mean difficulties. On the one hand Horace's own delicacy usually prevents specific reference except when he may be complimenting a contemporary, or when in a few cases the offender is

very obviously below class. On the other hand time has destroyed so much of the poetry which then loomed large that when Horace fails to specify we frequently fail to grasp the allusion. At times we can only surmise the nature of the foe that he is attacking, and yet it is safest to assume that the foe is a reality, not merely a phantom of a bygone day.

In his peculiar Euclidian fashion of illustrating before generalizing, Horace opens the *Epistle* with a picture of a weird composite beast and deduces thence the law of unity of composition. The reader's first reaction is to pronounce the paragraph a platitude. Even the artist of the Altamira cave knows the law, which is after all only a "form" of man's intellectual processes. Aristotle, who realized that descriptive science consists largely in phrasing the obvious and looking wise, had long ago stated the essential facts about "the beginning, the middle, and the end." But Horace reiterated and restated this law, not because he found it in a "printed book," but because he lived in an age of literary aberrations when this simple and primitive law needed re-emphasis. It had suffered obfuscation from several causes. First, Ennius had caused trouble, not through direct violation of the principle, for he had composed his epic narrative in soundly proportioned triads and hexads; but, when his complete work was issued as a whole, it failed to carry the impression of a unified climactic tale, and his successors, misled by this work—men like Hostius and Furius and even the post-Vergilian Lucan and Silius Italicus—essayed to narrate unorganized history in pseudo-epic form. Such work called for protest, not only in the form of example, which Vergil provided in his *Aeneid*, but also by precept, and it is for such that Horace says (l. 139):

Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.

But more insidious than this misread example of Ennius was the fondness for fine writing that Alexandrian romanticism had fostered at Rome in Horace's youth. If we possessed the popular poetry of that day we should know whose misplaced descriptions of woods and rainbows called forth the curse at "purple patches." We probably have a hint in line 17, if the reference there to a poet of the

Rhine impugns the "turgid porkfed Celt," Furius, whom Horace elsewhere laughs at for similar excrescences. This man was of the "new-fashioned" school which Horace battled against all his life, now by precept, now by example, now by studied neglect. It is indeed the narrative of the "little epicists" that he has in mind throughout the opening of the *Ars Poetica*, men like Catullus and Calvus, Valerius Cato and Cinna, the authors of the *Ciris* and the *Culex*. This group, following the methods inaugurated in the late Greek world, retold myths and legends in a form which emphasized description and sentimental character-drawing to the detriment of the plot. The *Ciris* is a case in point. The daughter of the king of Megara falls in love with King Minos, who is besieging her native city. Hope of success depends upon her filching from her father the charm which renders his city invulnerable. After much distress of soul she ultimately drives herself to the treasonable act—Minos takes the city but punishes the maiden for her treachery. Epic-like, the story leaps *in medias res* and forgets to explain the beginning. There is not a word of how or why the siege began or how the maiden met and loved the enemy. The story loiters over and fondles the compelling passion of the distraught princess, her revulsion at the contemplation of her unfilial rôle, her stumbling and fumbling in the dark toward the door of her father, only to faint upon the threshold. At this point her nurse revives her and tells a long tale of another maiden once equally beset by unkind love, and this inner tale similarly loiters and fondles melodrama. The vital facts come by leaps and bounds in a few obscure phrases. This is not narrative at all. In form it reminds one of nothing so much as Keats's *Endymion*—a true Alexandrian epyllion suffused with the richer lusciousness of the modern romances. So Catullus in the "Peleus and Thetis" describes the sea voyage where hero and sea nymph met. Then he overleaps years to the wedding, only to dwell upon the woes of Ariadne depicted on the coverlet of the wedding couch; hence back to the causes of Ariadne's woes, thence forward to the vengeance upon Ariadne's faithless lover; then back again to the wedding to hear the wedding song celebrating Achilles, who is to be the fruit of this union, and then the tale sings itself to sleep.



Clearly this is the type that Horace refers to in his composite beast which is neither fish nor fowl. To be sure when he implies that it is a product of the poet's failure to realize his own limitations, that it comes of a landscape painter's essaying illustration or a detail-worker attempting bold statuary, he may be partly on the wrong scent or he may be turning a precept which the Pisos presumably needed. His direct address to "pater et juvenes" at this point seems to imply that Horace appreciated all too well the limitations of Piso. But in his soul he doubtless knew that the rambling methods of those epics were not wholly due to lack of discipline and to thoughtless choice of subject-matter. He must have known that the new school of poets chose deliberately to luxuriate in the wilderness of sentimentality and lawless invention. Indeed narrative poetry had been driven to this pass to avoid suffocation. Though it was still necessary to retell myths and legends—since society was not yet ripe for realism—such retelling could not continue indefinitely along Homeric lines: a new method must be found. And the "new school" was trying one way out. It assumed a general knowledge of the tale—the warp and woof was woven ages ago—and then proceeded to embroider it with gold and dazzling oriental colors. The epyllion marked a clear revolt from natural forms commended by common sense; it consciously deserted intelligence for emotion and sentiment. No wonder that the well-disciplined Horace objected. And he was not alone in his position. Vergil too had lived through the romantic fever and had found the cure for it. It had indeed enriched his store of words, opened his eyes to new depths of human emotion, taught him the trick of judicious omission of obvious details; but after learning this he realized also with Horace that the vices of the Alexandrian style were inherent in forcing originality upon a worn-out plot. He therefore struck out into work of a new creation where he could liberate himself from the mazes of the new method. He gives intellect free play in organizing his material, but he never allows himself to become inconsequential or episodic: he never sews in the *purpureus pannus*. Whatever Aristotle or his followers may have said about the subject, Horace in the opening paragraph of the *Ars Poetica* means to insist that the epyllion has shown the

wrong method, Vergil the right one—and the lesson was never more needed.

There follows (ll. 46-72) a paragraph on diction in which after a warning against recklessness the critic reminds the reader that as words naturally vary in longevity a reasonable attitude must be assumed toward poets like Vergil who dare to coin new words and extend the connotation of old ones by effective collocations. The discussion of diction was at that time a burning question which flamed up even at court. Maecenas, disheveled in style as in dress and character, wantoned over the whole range of the Latin dictionary. He cared only for the immediate effect, and since his mother-tongue was Etruscan the "speech of the old shirt-sleeved Cato" possessed no odor of sanctity for him. The new style<sup>1</sup> induced by oriental teachers of Greek—against which even Cicero had fought—was his meat and drink. His prose is a mosaic of phrases, each more startling and surprising than the last. And it matters little how the effect is produced: whether by pithy brevity, by sheer strength, by forced imagery, by misplaced poetic diction, by obvious colloquialism, by striking rhythm, or by the audacity of the subject-matter. There is a flavor of Oscar Wilde about the meretricious prettiness and gracility of his turns. Now and then, however, he seems to be striving for paradox and epigram—the orthodox style of essayist of our own day. And his diction is of a pattern with his phrase, for he knew no suggestion of restraint and no restricting law. He uses words now epic in tone, now drawn from the street, and uses them with little care as to their precise meaning—often indeed they are beaded into strange phrases whence they draw new connotations from the context. When Latin words fail him, he employs transliterated Greek words, or shapes new ones with meanings suggested by foreign words. Contemporary critics were forced to imitate him in order to get adequate vocabulary with which to characterize his style. The emperor spoke of his phrases as myrrh-scented curls, and, adopting the Maecenatic jargon, called him his "Etruscan ivory, his Arretine

<sup>1</sup> As practiced by Laevius (see Gellius xix. 7) it resembled the euphuism which usually breaks out after a period of classical sobriety. The inferior writer must resort to startling effects if he is to attract attention. Varro's satire in *Papipapae* seems to be directed in part against this fashion.

perfume, his Tiburtine pearl," and a dozen other outlandish names. Seneca characterizes the man as a fop and his style as intarsia, while Tacitus resorts to the curling iron for a suitable figure, and though these criticisms were usually concerned with his prose they apply equally well to his verse.

Maecenas as the patron of all the foremost poets of his day naturally exerted no mean influence in literary matters, and Horace doubtless had to defend his own position when he attempted to resist the arguments of this holder of purse strings. But the ideals of Maecenas did not occupy the field alone. There were men who went to the very opposite extreme, purists who prided themselves upon using Latin from its unsullied fountains, who refused to touch a foreign phrase, a word of recent coinage and without patina, who held poetic diction sacred and not to be tainted with words of lowly associations, and who studied the old uncontaminated Romans like Cato to keep on the safe side. Caesar, though no slavish formalist in his own expression, set the motto of this school in his grammatical essay: "Avoid," he said, "a new word as a sailor shuns a crag." Horace's friend, Asinius Pollio, one of these purists, applied his doctrine not only to his formal speeches and his historical work but also to his tragedies, for Tacitus found in him the musty flavor of Pacuvius and Accius. "Confound words that confound thought," was his pithy motto. To the same school of purists belonged Messala and the youthful Tiberius, patron of a group of literary dilettantes to whom Horace occasionally addressed versified notes.

Such were the extremists. Between the two stood the prosaic but sane Augustus, who felt called upon to prescribe laws of art as well as of society. He laughed good humoredly at the fondness of Maecenas for "curly and anointed phrases" as at the musty expressions dusted out of the attic by Tiberius. He enjoyed the simple delusion that the first duty of language was to express thought clearly and directly, without let or hindrance. Now such battles of words have always been and probably will always be. No doubt Neoptolemus had expressed himself on the subject. Horace, however, says his say not because some Greek critic before him had to choose between intransigent purists and anarchists

of speech, but because the life and death of Roman poetry seemed to him to be at stake on the throw. Horace does not vote wholly with the group represented by Maecenas nor, on the other hand, with the supersensitive schoolmasters. As usual he shows a leaning toward liberalism tempered with sanity. And there he stands with Vergil again. Why, he says, shall not your critic (the specific word *Romanus* is surely intentional here) grant Vergil and Varius the privileges formerly given to Plautus and Caecilius? And Horace, realizing the impoverished condition of his native language, pleads that it be not kept to the limitations of dictionary words and meanings. Let poets, he urges, coin Latin words with meanings found in reading Greek authors, and do not pettily carp at them when they produce studied and imaginative collocations of words outside of conventional phrase-lists. Horace himself enriched Latin in this very letter by such innovations upon Greek models as: *prodigialiter*, l. 29; *potenter*, l. 40; *dominantia*, l. 234; *iuvenentur*, l. 246, etc., as Vergil had already done (e.g., *longaeus*, *antrum*, *auricomus*, *ignipotens*, *sopor*, etc.). The extension of meanings by imaginative phrase-making was indeed one of the arts for which Horace was celebrated, and his "cunning felicity" of phrase, remarked by Petronius and Quintilian, needs no illustration in an age which has turned his lines into quotations. It matters little then whether Neoptolemus thought this or that upon the subject. Horace formulated in the *Ars Poetica* the precept which he had always practiced despite the extremists in both camps hurling weapons at each other over his head. The end of the paragraph is wholly Horatian, whosoever may have said the like before: *usus quem penes arbitrium et jus et norma dicendi* must be the final judge of diction.

There follows a paragraph on the appropriate meters for various forms. The elegiac is suited to sad themes and to epigram (the pointed epigram of Martial was not yet, and Horace would doubtless have objected to it), the iambic to invective, a statelier iambic to tragic dialogue, certain lyric meters to themes of praise and love—"and if I do not know the temper and spirit of each verse form or if I ignore them what right have I to the name of poet?" "Mere red tape," insists Saintbury. But to Horace this was not mere



red tape. Every sane critic of his day felt that the Latin hexameter was in danger of being overweighted and that the lines of comedy failed in lightness through the burden of spondees imposed by the abundance of long syllables. This was known and felt to be more or less unavoidable. There were evils, however—due to ignorance and to refusal to train the ear to the proper ethos of verse—which Horace had more at heart. From the time of Laevius, who had in his polymetra of late Greek style broken over all restraint and had even in thorough cubistic fashion shaped his lines to picture graphically the object of which he wrote, there had been manifest at Rome a failure to observe not only conventions but even proprieties. And conventions do not go for naught in poetry. It may be that the meters of our Mother Goose rhymes were not originally limited to one sphere of verse, but after those rhymes became extensively known this particular meter had acquired certain associations which may not be neglected with impunity. The same is true of Dryden's couplet, of Milton's blank verse, and a host of other forms. So there can be little doubt that Horace, schooled in the Greek poets of the great age, must have chafed under the innovations of the "new school." Catullus was particularly exasperating. In his youth a clever and ambitionless versifier, he had spent his time writing lampoons and *vers de société* in the meters of trifles. After he met Lesbia an intense passion possessed his verse, but he recklessly continued to use hendecasyllables and halt-iambics, writing doubtless for himself and not for the public. But when the public was admitted, one can imagine the puzzle of many readers at the most poignant song of the group written in scazons:

miser Catulle desinas ineptire!

Indeed more than one modern critic, decoyed by the literary associations of the scazon from Hipponax to the Latin Matius, insists on reading the poem as a scurrilous satire, mistaking the naïve cry of childish sympathy in *scelesta*, *vae te*, for an imprecation. In fact Catullus is largely at fault, for he recklessly disregarded the proprieties, and Horace who knew the facts was right in calling his predecessors to task for abusing their privileges and disregarding the obligation to give ear to fitness and to study well-established

conventions. Horace doubtless found fault also with their rules of versification, even when they used appropriate meters. The *Sapphics* of Catullus for instance show that he was not following the latest Roman theorists but was simply deducing his own system first hand from his reading of old poets. It may be true that to our ear the *Sapphics* of Catullus seem less stilted and formal than those of Horace, but if we knew more about Latin quantity and Latin accent perhaps we should understand why Horace adopted the strait-jacket laws imposed by Varro and followed by Caesius Bassus. Be that as it may, Horace rightly or wrongly felt that the *neoteroi* did not study verse technique with sufficient care, furthermore—and here he was undoubtedly right—that they disregarded a vital tradition in employing verse forms like the scazon and the elegiac with subject-matter that had never before been associated with them.

The whole truth in this question is now beyond us, for we possess too few Greek lyrics and we know too little about the ethos of ancient verse forms to be capable of judging in the matter. But it would not be going too far to add that verse based upon quantity—as we may judge from music, which is quantitative—shows more sensitiveness to metrical variety than verse based, like ours, upon stress alone. Moreover, our meters are so few and simple, and these few must do service for so wide a range of expression, that we are utterly unfit to appreciate the fine distinctions wrought by the great abundance of feet and cola of Greek and Latin verse. When the English trochee, for instance, must serve the purposes of elegy, satire, love songs, and heroic verse, it is hopeless to suppose that our trochee will ever require an individual ethos. This is enough to warn us not to assume that metrical rules were mere red tape to Horace though they might of necessity be so to us. In considering the work of his rash predecessors, then, Horace had unquestioned reason for asking: *Cur ego si nequeo ignoroque, poeta salutor*. And it was with this fact in mind that he repeatedly made the proud claim that it was he who first introduced the true lyric measures to Rome.

Another important paragraph of the *Epistle* (ll. 193 ff.) inveighs against the misuse of the chorus in tragedy and, in immediate

connection, against the growing importance of the musical element to the detriment of the text. Aristotle had found it necessary to raise the same objections to innovations of his day, holding Euripides guilty of both charges, and Horace doubtless found similar attacks in the post-Aristotelian critics. However, scholars have not failed to note that Horace has reasons of his own for raising the same questions once more. The question of the chorus must be considered in connection with the proper place of music in tragedy, but it will be convenient to dwell first upon the peculiar evolution of the chorus that created the situation which Horace deprecates. Despite Aristotle's criticism that Euripides and Agathon seemed to be reducing the dramatic chorus to the position of mere *entr'acte* entertainers that had no vital part in the essential development of the plot, the innovation, for reasons that we need not discuss, increased in favor. On the Hellenistic stage it would seem that even the old plays were reshaped in such a way as to permit new choral odes written in the style of music-hall songs to be inserted in place of the originals. At Rome the first dramatists, Livius and Naevius, apparently reproduced this new-fashioned element in staging their plays, for it was in this form that they had seen Greek plays given at Tarentum, Naples, and Syracuse. Ennius, however, inspired more by the earlier Greeks than by Hellenistic productions, endeavored to revitalize the choral odes,<sup>1</sup> make the subject-matter an integral part of the play, and connect the choral singing with the action. And in this reaction to older models he was followed by Pacuvius and Accius, many of whose plays were produced at Rome in Horace's youth. In fact these later dramatists, in response to a true Roman demand for realism, often went even farther than Sophocles in merging chorus and action. Ennius for example substituted a band of soldiers for the original maiden chorus in his *Iphigenia* in order to secure more natural interplay. To carry out the effect he even shifted from one chorus to another in the middle of the play, since, when the scene shifted, the original group proved to be incongruous with the developing plot. So in the *Eumenides*, a new chorus is made up of Areopagites at the end, and in the *Hectoris*

<sup>1</sup> See Duckett, *Studies in Ennius*, p. 61.

*Lutra* the Nereids seem to displace the soldiers. Pacuvius likewise substituted for the group of citizens a chorus of Maenads in the *Antiope*, while Accius in his *Antigone* substituted watchmen for the greybeards of Sophocles in the interest of verisimilitude. These are but a few illustrations of how the best of the dramatists attempted to use the chorus in the most natural fashion.

But about Horace's time a change took place. The methods of Ennius and Accius were abandoned and those of the Hellenistic stage once more came into favor. The tragedies of Seneca have survived to prove what this change was like. These closet-dramas of Seneca differ from the Accian plays in two essential points that concern us here. The main part of the play is heavily loaded down with monologues, soliloquies, and rather static dialogue which would readily lend themselves to detached recitation, that is, to dramatic musical recitation—for the tragedy was more like a modern oratorio than a modern play. Secondly, the choral odes are usually mere *entr'acte* musical numbers.

Now it is apparent that the peculiar nature of these plays might be explained by the fact that Seneca was no dramatist, that he could not put life and action into his characters, and it would not be underestimating him to advance such an argument. Yet there is evidence that some of these peculiarities existed before his day. Whether or not Pollio and Varius wrote in this style is doubtful, not to say improbable; but the keen critic, Leo, has observed that Ovid quite certainly did—and the significant fact is that his *Medea* was apparently written at about the same time as Horace's *Ars Poetica*. Of the other tragedies of that day we know nothing, but it is not likely that Ovid stood alone.

To go a step farther, it has been supposed that this new rhetorical drama was the outcome of a demand for closet-drama when tragedy began to lose its place on the boards, and it is patent that the writing of plays for reading and recitation rather than for acting would on the whole produce the same effect that Seneca's plays give. But if we may take the cue from Horace's strictures here and in another epistle, the vicious disease that attacked the drama arose out of theatrical performances themselves. In his day the plays were overstaged (II, 190), the characters dressed



too elaborately (II, 207), the lines too heavily weighted with rhetoric (II, 217), musicians were brought upon the stage when music was no longer ancillary to the text but made an end in itself (II, 215), and, as has been mentioned, the chorus was treated as a disjunctive element (II, 197). Now we have no precise description of just how the drama evolved these qualities, but it is patent that the phenomena described by Horace are precisely those that one might expect from the reaction of the very popular pantomime of the day upon legitimate tragedy. It was just a few years before the *Ars Poetica* was written that Pylades caught the applause of Rome by presenting—dancing, as he called it—parts of tragedies in pantomime. The process seems to have been something like this: while a chorus sang extracts or adapted portions of some tragedy to the music of an elaborate orchestra, Pylades acted in dumb show—or danced—the appropriate rôle. In this performance the actor was the all-important performer, and the music was exceedingly elaborate for those times: the libretto was of minor consideration since the story was well known and the words were well-nigh inaudible. As in our opera the text was so nearly negligible that, though several noted poets wrote for such performances, the lines were seldom preserved, and none have survived to our day.

Now these pantomimes became exceedingly popular at once, and it was not long before they were the only form in which tragedy really had a chance of presentation. Whether the performer gave scenes and adaptations of old plays or brought out new librettos especially produced for him, the Romans soon came to speak of *cantare* and *saltare tragoediam*, not of *agere*. Of course the immediate success of this form with the "tired business man" of Rome reacted upon the drama at once, and their reaction was of the kind that Horace has noted. The pantomime could naturally make more use of portions of tragedy that were composed as monologues, and simpler dialogues, than of intricate and involved dramatic scenes, and the elaborate chorus and orchestra needed choral odes that were units in themselves and not involved in or too much a vital part of the play. Hence arose the temptation of dramatic writers to shape their plays in such a way that scenes and songs might be

extracted for performance. If arias and choruses from Ovid's *Medea* were given in concerts and the pantomime danced the music of the mad-scene, why should not an author be tempted, like the makers of Italian operas of today, to bear the possibility in mind? To carry out the comparison, Horace was then in the position of Wagner when he insisted upon the prime importance of a harmonious production with the text as most vital, the music as interpretative, and with an orchestra demoted to a mezzanine beneath the stage. But even before the pantomime enticed the tragedy into such questionable ways, the very spirit that popularized such entertainments had already made its influence felt upon the tragedy. In Cicero's day there were actors who made tragedy an extravaganza of the eye and ear, the very evil against which Horace inveighs. It is clear that the play had started in the direction even before the innovation of Pylades. However, the success of the pantomime enables us now to understand what the vices were that Horace had to combat, and it also proves that Horace had those vices immediately before his eyes, and not only in a paragraph of Neoptolemus.

Enough has perhaps been said to show that though Horace may, as the scholiast affirms, have brought together some of the precepts of Neoptolemus, he nevertheless, as a writer of some twenty years' experience, concerned himself primarily with principles pertinent to the literature of his own day—literature which the scholiast knew little about. As a piece of literary criticism the *Ars Poetica* hardly lays claim to great rank. It does not search for essential general principles with the sureness of Aristotle's famous work, nor has Horace the gift of divining the abode of genius which Longinus possessed. Nevertheless the *Ars Poetica* must not be characterized as an inconsequential paraphrase of an older critic nor as a collection of irrelevant rules. It grew out of a clear understanding of Roman literature, and it was written by a cultivated poet of high artistic ideals courageously advocating flawless and unstinting work. Even when through lack of evidence we fail to disclose the particular tendency that Horace is criticizing we are nevertheless justified in assuming that he is urging a precept of immediate and vital application.

## CUMAE IN LEGEND AND HISTORY

BY ELIZABETH HAZELTON HAIGHT  
Vassar College

At a famous banquet, probably held at Cumae, the host, Trimalchio, in the midst of some remarkable classical allusions told this anecdote: "Nam Sibyllam quidem [Cumis] ego ipse oculis meis vidi in ampulla pendere, et cum illi pueri dicerent: Σίβυλλα, τί θέλεις; respondebat illa: ἀποθανεῖν θέλω."<sup>1</sup> The Sibyl's wish has never been gratified, for no longer inclosed in a jar, but enshrined in the majestic temple of Vergil's *Aeneid*, she lives forever, and the magic of her name flashes across the memory whenever the word "Cumae" is spoken. What else indeed, we might ask, is left of Cumae now but the Sibyl? Greek coins with a female head on the obverse (perhaps the Sibyl) and a mussel on the reverse (the Lucrine oyster); the vases in the Raccolta Cumana in the Naples Museum, fragmentary inscriptions, a vineyard-covered acropolis—scant remains of the first Greek settlement in Italy these!

But the city itself, apart from its great priestess, had a history extending from its mythical founding in 1050 B.C. (Eusebius' date) to its final destruction in 1207 A.D., and scattered through classical literature are fragmentary references and brief narratives that pieced together give a strong personality to the little hill, if indeed a city, like a person, may have in spite of all vicissitudes a definite character. It is my wish, in presenting this brief preliminary sketch of the history of Cumae, on which I am working, to make the city more of a reality to teachers and students of the *Aeneid*.

The sources for a history of the city range from the fifth century B.C. (a brief reference in Thucydides) to the sixth century A.D. (when Procopius and Agathias tell its part in the Gothic wars), and the list of authorities is long: Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Strabo, Diodorus, Livy, Velleius, Plutarch, Pliny the Elder, Tacitus, Appian, Dio Cassius, Pausanias—these are but a few of them.

<sup>1</sup> Cena. Trim. 48.

Partial outlines of Cumaeen history have been made by Beloch, Nissen, and Mommsen,<sup>1</sup> and certain dissertations<sup>2</sup> have been written about the early history of the city. Then scattered through the volumes of the *Notizie* are many references to small finds on the hill, chiefly in the Necropolis, and the Guida del Museo Nazionale di Napoli<sup>3</sup> describes the Raccolta Cumana there. The coins, inscriptions, and vases help fill in gaps about the staple commodities of the city, its officials, its religious cults. From all these sources let me try to construct a brief history, postponing the consideration of the Sibyl and her relation to Cumae to another paper.

In a dateless period of Greek emigration before the reckoning by Olympiads a seafaring band came to a new shore in the west. They were a religious people and believed that their course had been guided by divine signs. Some had seen a dove (the messenger of Apollo Archegetes) fly before the fleet, others had heard at night clashing cymbals like the sounds in Demeter's mysteries.<sup>4</sup> However that might be, they came to shore and settled on what they thought was the mainland. It proved to be an island, Ischia, and though the climate was mild, the land fertile, and there were gold mines there, the Greek expedition was not satisfied, and after founding Pithecusae some of the more ambitious moved on.<sup>5</sup> The party seemed to have been made up of colonists from different places, for it had two leaders (Hippocles, a Cumaeen, and Megas-thenes, a Chalcidean), and they worked in amity, agreeing, when at last they found a sightly hill near the shore on the mainland, that the settlement should be named Cumae for one leader, but the colony should be called a Chalcidean foundation in honor of the other. So the first Greek city in Italy was founded.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> J. Beloch, *Campanien, Topographie, Geschichte und Leben der Umgebung Neapels in Alterthum*, 1879; H. Nissen, *Italische Landeskunde*, ii<sup>2</sup>, 1902; T. Mommsen, *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, X, 350-51.

<sup>2</sup> H. Schwenger, *De primordiis rebusque Cumarum*, 1840; C. Fricke, *De origine Cumarum*, 1869; M. E. Scotti, *Dissertazione corografico-istorica delle due antiche distrutte città Miseno, e Cuma* (1775).

<sup>3</sup> Pp. 482-89.

<sup>4</sup> Vell. i. 4; Stat. Silv. iii. 5. 79-80.

<sup>5</sup> Livy viii. 22.

<sup>6</sup> Strabo v. 4. For other theories of the colonization see Fricke, *De origine Cumarum*, pp. 5-7.

It was a strange region to which the Greeks had come, for the land which looked so solid was honeycombed with caves, and caves are awesome. Tradition says that a people of the dark dwelt in them when the Greeks came to Italy—the Cimmerians, who never saw the light of day.<sup>1</sup> They went from one cavern to another by underground tunnels. They lived, indeed, by mining and by giving forth oracles in one sacred cavern, and even the kings of the land made grants of money to them, at least until they were exterminated. The oracle played false with one king, and he in anger destroyed all the cave people.

Such hidden enemies the Cumaeans had to dread; and then there were other dangers in the district, for example, a poisonous lake. Even the birds could not fly across, but fell into the water because of the deadly vapors. This Avernus was really near a door of the lower world, and strangers who were wise made sacrifice there to the gods under the earth.<sup>2</sup> Some even say that it was here that Odysseus came in his wanderings and met the spirits of the dead. It was a terrifying region for the Cumaeans, but their own gods had come with them—Apollo, Demeter—and they erected temples to them and to Zeus, the father, on the hill and went on their quiet, peaceful way. The city from the first prospered, and its power was not confined within the walls built around its acropolis, but extended across the so-called Phlegraean plain to the coast.<sup>3</sup> It was a rich country which the hill dominated, and the thrifty Cumaeans cultivated it so well that in time the Romans often came to them to buy corn.<sup>4</sup> Fine cabbages, too, were raised,<sup>5</sup> and the wine from Mount Gaurus was famous. Moreover, the Greeks had brought their old craftsmanship with them, and their pottery was purchased by the Oscans. You can see their beautiful vases today in the Naples Museum.

In the eighth century the city was strong enough to send out a colony, for one of the founders of Zancle in Sicily was Perieres, a Cumaeon,<sup>6</sup> and earlier another band had founded Triteia in Achaia.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Strabo v. 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Strabo v. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Livy ii. 9.

<sup>5</sup> Colum. x. 127.

<sup>6</sup> Thuc. vi. 4.

<sup>7</sup> Paus. vii. 22. 6.



In the seventh century too Neapolis grew up as an offshoot of Cumae, that city which was destined to surpass her mother later in brilliancy and fame. But now in the seventh and sixth centuries Cumae was at the height of her power.

It was this *eὐδαιμονία* of the city and nothing else that awoke the hostility of her neighbors, and several nations, among them the Etruscans, allied themselves in 524 against the Greek πόλις.<sup>1</sup> The league was powerful and placed in the field against Cumae 500,000 foot soldiers and 18,000 horsemen. The Greeks had a tiny army, 600 cavalry and 4,500 infantry, and their morale might have failed if it had not been for the marvelous omen that came to them. The two rivers which flowed near the camp of the enemy forsook their natural beds and flowed back upstream to their sources. The Cumaeans believed that the gods were on their side and marched boldly out against the tens of thousands.

The place too was an ally of the valor of the Cumaeans, for it was narrow and girt with mountains and swamps, so that the league had no chance to use its numbers; and during the battle a god again helped the brave little people by sending forth thunder and lightning and rain, so that the enemy feared and fled. One man won glory beyond all others that day, Aristodemus, surnamed Malacus, for he slew with his own hand the leader of the enemy and many other brave warriors. Now when the battle was over and the Cumaeans had offered due sacrifice and made splendid burial for those who had died on the field, they came into great strife among themselves, trying to decide to whom to give the first crown for valor. The people were all for Aristodemus, for, as his name shows, he was one of them, but the rulers and the senate favored the Hipparch, Hippomedon. Cumae was an aristocracy and the people had little power, but in this matter they were so persistent that the nobles, fearing a revolution, diplomatically decided to divide the honors.

That was the beginning of Aristodemus' career. He saw his chance and became a popular orator, haranguing the poor and spending much of his private fortune in largess for them. Nearly twenty years after his first success his military genius found free

<sup>1</sup> Dion. Hal. vii. 3.

play in another war. A commission came to Cumae from Aricia asking help because they were being besieged by the Etruscans under Arruns, the son of Lars Porsena. The rulers of Cumae saw and seized a plausible pretext for ridding themselves of the dangerous Aristodemus. They persuaded the people to send two thousand men to help Aricia and they appointed Aristodemus general in command because, as they proclaimed, of his distinguished military service. They gave him undisciplined troops and ten old, unseaworthy vessels and thought he would die in battle or shipwreck.

Aristodemus, remarking dryly that the plans of his enemies did not escape him, accepted the command, somehow transported the Arician commission and his small army in safety, and by a rapid march surprised the Etruscans and encouraged the Aricians to come out and join him in open fighting. His victory was no less rapid and complete than before, and again he slew with his own hand the leader of the enemy. Back he sailed to Cumae, laden with gifts from the Aricians, at the head of a victorious army absolutely loyal to himself. They took their own news of the victory up into the city and Cumae went mad over them—men, women, and children—all but those who had maliciously planned that the expedition should be disastrous. The rulers must have been apprehensive during the few days in which Aristodemus bided his time, making sacrifices to the gods, but at last he called an assembly to make his official report. He was holding the crowd spell-bound by his dramatic account of the battle when suddenly his fellow-plotters, with swords hidden under their robes, rushed into the senate-house and slew all the aristocrats. The crowd dispersed in terror, but the next day Aristodemus called the people together again, justified the executions, and proclaimed that he was giving to the other citizens a free government and freedom of speech.

To curry favor he then stooped to the low means which tyrants adopt—distribution of land and absolution of debts—and so got himself made a dictator, or *στρατηγὸς . . . αὐτοκράτωρ*. And by means no less ignoble he sought to secure his power, for he craftily disarmed all citizens on a pretext of avoiding civil dissension; he

let the assassins prostitute the wives and daughters of the former despots; he deported all the sons of the slain nobles into rural districts where they would have no education, but be used as farm hands; and he effeminized the young men left in Cumae by setting fashions of luxuriant raiment, of wearing the hair long, of using perfumes and sunshades.

The mistake Aristodemus made (and he suspected it at the time, but was ill-advised) was in not killing the sons of the former rulers of Cumae. These young men now plotted together and gathered in the deep woods around Avernus, craving vengeance. Our historian (Dionysius) tells us how one of the exiled youths, mutilating himself horribly, went into the city and told Aristodemus that in return for the torture inflicted on him by his fellows he would lead him and his army to their secret camping place. A whole night he led them through the woods while some of his friends took possession of Cumae, and then he handed over Aristodemus and his band to the exiles. Aristodemus, his sons, and his kinsmen were tortured until they died. So runs Dionysius' story of Cumae's great military leader.

Plutarch gives a more romantic version of the end of Aristodemus. And his story of Xenocrite is worth retelling.<sup>1</sup> Aristodemus had been passionately in love with this noble girl, and when he became tyrant and her father was driven into exile he took possession of her. The girl felt outraged at living with such a man, without dowry or legal bonds, and she longed for the freedom of her country no less than did those who were hated by the tyrant. Aristodemus, becoming more and more an oppressor, set the citizens of Cumae to digging a great trench around the place, not for any utilitarian motive, but to break the spirit of his people by wearing labor. One day a girl, who was standing near the trench diggers, saw Aristodemus approaching and she turned away, covering her face with her robe. After Aristodemus passed, the young men with much raillery asked her why, through a sense of shame, she avoided Aristodemus, when she had shown no such feelings toward the rest of them. The girl instantly answered: "Because Aristodemus is the only man among the Cumaeans." That taunt stirred every

<sup>1</sup> Plut. *De mulierum virtutibus* 26.

man of them and fired Xenocrite, who then and there declared that she would prefer, if her father were back in Cumae, to do his part of the ditch-digging rather than to share the luxury and power of Aristodemus. These words were flame to the fuel of conspiracy. The people plotted. Xenocrite let them into the palace at night and they easily killed the tyrant there. So the city of Cumae was freed by a woman, and it offered Xenocrite great gifts and honors. She refused them all and asked but one favor (can you imagine the romance of the saga?)—to bury the body of Aristodemus. This they granted, and they also made her a priestess of Demeter—an honor to the goddess and the woman. So runs Plutarch's story.

In the legend of Aristodemus a curious contradiction appears about his relation to the Tarquins. Now we find him fighting at Aricia against Arruns, son of Lars Porsena, and the Etruscan army.<sup>1</sup> Again he went to help, not Aricia, but Rome against the Etruscans when they were trying to restore Tarquinius Superbus to the throne.<sup>2</sup> But yet we have the story of the Cumaeen Sibyl selling her priceless volumes to that king. And we are informed, curiously enough, that Tarquinius Superbus, after his attempt to regain the throne was unsuccessful, betook himself to Aristodemus and died in Cumae.<sup>3</sup> Somehow, evidently, the histories of Cumae and of the Etruscans interlaced, but the story gives only a confused echo of prehistoric encounters. In spite of its inconsistencies the saga of Aristodemus is worthy, as Beloch says, of epic treatment, and he was no less a hero because his end, like that of Miltiades, was tragic failure.

When the power of the nobles was restored, there was no great leader in Cumae, and the little city was in dire danger from the Etruscans, whose sea power was growing. So Cumae had to appeal to Hiero of Syracuse for aid, and the Syracusan fleet fought a great naval battle near Cumae in 474 which broke forever the Etruscans' control of the sea and shook their sway in Campania. We have come to history now, and the British Museum possesses evidence of this battle in a votive helmet which Hiero dedicated

<sup>1</sup> Dion. Hal. vii. 5; Livy ii. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Plut. *De mul. virt.* 26.

<sup>3</sup> Livy ii. 21; Cic. *Tusc. Dis.* iii. 27.

to Zeus at Olympia, as its inscription shows: 'Ιέρων ὁ Δεινομένους καὶ οἱ Συρακόσιοι τῷ Διὶ Τυρρήνᾳ ἀπὸ Κύμης.<sup>1</sup> A Syracusan fortress arose on Ischia, and Cumae might have become dependent on Syracuse if it had not been for the unrest which prevailed there after Hiero's death.

A greater menace now came upon the Greeks in Cumae, and this time they did not escape. In 421 the Campanians attacked the city, broke down the walls, and took possession of it. Many of the inhabitants were killed, many enslaved; some fled to Naples.<sup>2</sup> "Cumanos Osca mutavit vicinia."<sup>3</sup> The Greek period of Cumae was over, and Oscan became the language of the city, as the inscriptions show. Yet Strabo says that even in his time much that was Greek remained: ὅμως δ' οὖν ἔτι σώζεται πολλὰ ἱχνυ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ κόσμου καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ τῶν νομίμων.<sup>4</sup>

Next Cumae with Capua came under the power of Rome and in 338 was granted partial citizenship, *civitas sine suffragio*.<sup>5</sup> The magistrates who came from Rome to proclaim this right were named from the two most important cities in their district *praefecti Capuam Cumas*.<sup>6</sup>

Over a hundred years of history passed on quietly and then Cumae seems to have recovered strength and character and to be playing her part in the Hannibalic war. In that terrible conflict the city remained true to Rome in spite of attempted corruption on the part of Campanian neighbors, devastation of the country by Hannibal, and his siege of the city. Livy chronicles for us how bravely Cumae withstood both intrigue and warfare.<sup>7</sup>

After the battle of Cannae the Campanians first urged Cumae to revolt from Rome, and failing in that appeal they began to plot against the city. An important religious ceremony was to be held by all the Campanians at Hamae, three miles north of Cumae, and they informed the Cumaeans that their own senate would be present and urged that the Cumaeans come also to make an offensive and defensive alliance with them, and they promised to have a

<sup>1</sup> J. Ward, *Greek Coins and Their Parent Cities*, pp. 203, 208.

<sup>2</sup> Livy iv. 44; Diod. xii. 76.

<sup>3</sup> Livy viii. 14.

<sup>4</sup> Vell. i. 4.

<sup>5</sup> *Festus*, s.v. "praefecturae," p. 233.

<sup>6</sup> Strabo v. 4.

<sup>7</sup> Livy xxiii. 35-37.



military guard there that no danger need be feared from Romans nor Carthaginians. The Cumaeans, suspecting treachery, accepted the plan but told the Roman consul, Ti. Sempronius Gracchus, who was at Sinuessa, what the Campanians had proposed and that the festival would come off in three days. Gracchus ordered the Cumaeans to bring all their people and possessions from the fields inside the city walls and to remain there. He himself the day before the festival moved his camp to Cumae. The Campanians were gathering at Hamae and their chief magistrate, Marcus Alfius, the meddix, was in secret charge of operations there. As the sacrifice was performed at night under cover of the dark, Gracchus led his army to Hamae and at midnight attacked the Campanians, who were utterly unprepared. An army of fourteen thousand men was defeated and more than two thousand men and the meddix were killed. Gracchus retreated hurriedly to Cumae knowing that Hannibal would never let this disaster to his allies pass unnoticed. And indeed the Carthaginians came on the next day in full force and with the engines of warfare to attack Cumae; and after devastating the *ager Cumanus* they pitched camp a mile from the city.

Gracchus was inside the walls directing the defense. To overtop the wooden tower which Hannibal was moving the consul erected another on the top of walls and from it the defenders hurled down rocks and missiles. When Hannibal's tower, in spite of this defense, reached the wall, they threw fire upon it until the men inside the tower were driven out by the flames. A brilliant sally was then made from the town by the two gates, and the whole force of the enemy was driven to its camp, so that on that day Hannibal seemed more besieged than besieger. Before the Carthaginians rallied from their surprise and rout Gracchus sounded a retreat and led his army back inside the city walls. Nor could he be tempted out again although the next day Hannibal drew up his battle line between his camp and the city. Disappointed in this and thinking Cumae could not be taken easily, Hannibal returned to his camp near Capua.

Apparently the smart of this defeat stayed in Hannibal's mind, for in 214, when he went to Lake Avernus to make sacrifices, as he

had before, he devastated again all the *ager Cumanus*, even to the promontory of Misenum.<sup>1</sup> And in 203 when he left Italy on the summons of Carthage, in the midst of his bitter self-reproaches he cursed his failures near Cumae: "Se centum millibus armatorum ad Trasumennum aut Cannas caesis circa Casilinum Cumasque et Nolam consenuisse."<sup>2</sup>

The Latinizing of the city of Cumae went on and culminated in 180 B.C., when Latin was recognized as the official language by the Roman senate: "Cumanis eo anno petentibus permissum ut publice Latine loquerentur."<sup>3</sup> The full right of citizenship was not granted until later, Mommsen thinks in the time of the Social War, and he traces the inscriptional evidence for believing that Cumae remained to the end of the free republic a *municipium civium Romanorum*.<sup>4</sup> He proves also that Augustus established a military colony there<sup>5</sup> and argues convincingly that this is the colonia of the *fabula Petroniana*.<sup>6</sup>

No dramatic history is recorded here during the empire, but the city was what Statius calls it, *quieta Cyme*.<sup>7</sup> To the pleasure-loving, fashionable Roman it was indeed only the *ianua Baiarum*.<sup>8</sup> The people were busy again in cultivating the rich plain and raising corn, flax,<sup>9</sup> and cabbages,<sup>10</sup> and in making wine.<sup>11</sup> The potters were making the red Campanian ware which Martial praised.<sup>12</sup> We know something of the government of the city, for inscriptions refer to praetors,<sup>13</sup> to duumvirs<sup>14</sup> and to the aedilship.<sup>15</sup> And Augustales are mentioned.<sup>16</sup> We know something too of the religious cults of the people, besides the worship at the famous temple of Apollo and the oracle of the Sibyl,<sup>17</sup> for Livy refers to the temple of Zeus;<sup>18</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Livy xxiv. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Livy xxx. 20.

<sup>3</sup> Livy xl. 42.

<sup>4</sup> N. 3711; Cic. *Ad Att.* x. 13. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Nn. 3703, 3704; Lib. Col. p. 232, 10.

<sup>6</sup> Mommsen in *C.I.L.*, X. 351.

<sup>7</sup> Silv. iv. 3. 65.

<sup>8</sup> Juv. i. 3. 4.

<sup>9</sup> Plin. xix. 10 f.

<sup>10</sup> Colum. x. 137; Plin. *N.H.* xix. 140.

<sup>11</sup> Athen. i. 48.

<sup>12</sup> xiv. 114.

<sup>13</sup> N. 3698.

<sup>14</sup> N. 3704.

<sup>15</sup> N. 3704.

<sup>16</sup> Nn. 3676, 3701.

<sup>17</sup> *Aen.* vi.

<sup>18</sup> Livy xxvii. 23.

Demeter was honored;<sup>1</sup> and there was a *collegium dendrophorum* in charge of *xv virum sacris faciundis*.<sup>2</sup>

Repeatedly too in the history of Cumae a sense of *religio* is manifested, that awe which eagerly sees divine portents. Livy tells of how at Cumae in 208 mice in the temple of Jupiter sweated gold,<sup>3</sup> and in 202 the orb of the sun seemed to grow smaller and there was a shower of stones,<sup>4</sup> and in 169 Apollo in the citadel wept three days and three nights.<sup>5</sup> This feeling of *religio* would naturally develop very strongly in a region near Avernûs, dedicated as it was to the gods of the lower world and in natural character awe-inspiring from deadly fumes, hot springs, earthquakes, deep woods, caves, and valleys. The people of Cumae were naturally religious. The history of the Cumaean in the empire is, however, only fragmentary, and the brilliant life from Rome that came near her centered at Baiae and on the Lucrine Lake. Quiet Cumae was a place for unknown men to live in. An *arbiter elegantium* like Petronius would come there only to cut his veins and die after life's fitful fever.<sup>6</sup>

It was not until the time of the Gothic wars that Cumae was again the scene of military action. Then as it was the only fortified city in Campania besides Neapolis, it was repeatedly attacked.<sup>7</sup> Belisarius took it in 536, Totila later held it, and finally in 552 Narses gained possession of it with the whole treasure of the Goths.<sup>8</sup> It was important even later as a fortress and was destroyed completely only in about 1207 by Neapolis (its own child!) as a nest of robbers. How had the Greek city founded under Apollo's guidance fallen!

Any student of ancient history is bound now to ask how archaeology supports, contradicts, or extends tradition. Peculiarly illuminating and detailed is the answer given to this question in regard to the history of Cumae by E. Gàbrici in his monumental work, *Cuma*.<sup>9</sup> Gàbrici's archaeological investigation (on the basis

<sup>1</sup> Plut. *De mul. virt.* 26.

<sup>2</sup> Livy xliii. 13. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Nn. 3699, 3700.

<sup>4</sup> Tac. *Ann.* xvi. 19.

<sup>5</sup> Livy xxvii. 23.

<sup>7</sup> Procopius *Bell. Goth.* i. 14; iii. 6; iv. 34-35.

<sup>6</sup> Livy xxx. 38. 8.

<sup>8</sup> Agathias *Hist.* i. 8-11, 20.

<sup>9</sup> *Cuma* by E. Gàbrici in "Monumenti Antichi della reale accademidai dei lincei," Vol. XXII<sup>1-2</sup>, 1913, Milano.

of previous excavations and his own) first of all supplies material about the pre-Hellenic civilization of Cumae concerning which legend tells little in its hints of Cimmerian cave dwellers. Before the Chalcidean settlers came to Cumae, the indigenous people of Italy, descendants of the neolithic, had been crowded south by the northern Aryans and forced to seek a port for their commerce on the Tyrrhenian sea. This pre-Hellenic Cumae goes back probably to the last half of the eleventh century B.C. We know that the Cumaeans of this period burned their dead. They used the fibulas with an arched bow. They made certain forms of vases: a jar with two handles and a conical neck, a conical cup with a handle and incurved rim, and various types of large cups. They used as decorations on their vases various geometrical schemes (the triangle with internal strokes, the broken line), the large fluting, graffiti and incisions made with a large point, the fish, the flying bird.

Even in this pre-Hellenic period of Cumae Aegean navigators must have come to their shores, for these earliest Cumaeans showed contact with the Greeks in the form of their amphora, the attempt to express the human figure in geometrical forms, the use of the meander. And the latest pre-Hellenic tombs of Cumae are distinguished by the presence of objects foreign to the industry of Italy at this time, which attest closer commercial relations with the Aegean navigators.

Toward the end of the ninth century it was, Gàbrici thinks, that the Chalcideans took possession at Cumae. Eusebius' date (1050) for the Greek settlement is apparently based on a confusion with the time of the earliest settlement of the pre-Hellenic population. The Chalcidean colony flourished at Cumae, developing its own pottery and extending its industry in Italy until at the end of the eighth century and in the seventh the Chalcideans came into conflict with the Etruscan influence which also had penetrated the interior districts of Italy, and the Etruscan proved the stronger. Here again the archaeological remains show the vague conflicts and connections with the Etruscans which legend hints. By the end of the eighth century Cumae seems to have been receiving the products of the Etruscan metal industry.

In the seventh and sixth centuries Cumae had commercial relations with the countries of the Eastern Mediterranean, especially with Rhodes and Corinth, as the many vases in the *Raccolta Cumana* show. In the second half of the sixth century the maritime power of Cumae declined before the Etruscan control of the sea, and for this reason there are few Attic vases of the severe type in the Italian necropolises. That this Etruscan sea dominion was broken by the naval victory of the Cumaeans and Syracusans over the Etruscans is shown by the fact that Attic commerce was resumed at Cumae and the Attic pottery of the fifth century is abundant there.

The coinage of Cumae, which began in the sixth century, suggests the flourishing power of the city under Aristodemus. The first coin types go back to electron and silver coinage of Asia Minor and Greece, thus showing that when Cumae began to coin she was connected with the Aegean countries by artistic traditions and commercial interests.

How the Samnite invasion of Cumae disturbed the social order and civilization of the city is attested by the fact that after this event the Greek pottery of the end of the fifth century and the beginning of the fourth is not found in the Cumaeian tombs. New excavations are necessary to extend our knowledge of the Samnite period. The coffin tombs are characteristic of the whole Samnite rule.

Incineration did not appear until the Roman occupation. In the Roman period toward the end of the third century there appeared a new type of sepulchral architecture, formed of parallelopipeds with a stele above. The lowest contains in a hollow the ashes, or a *cinerarium* containing them. In the richest sepulchers the stele has some architectural decoration (pilasters, half-columns, molding). The architectural character of the Roman tomb is richer than the equipment for the dead.

This brief summary of Gàbrici's work fails to show with what care he has reviewed remains of walls, temples, and cave on the Cumaeian acropolis, how he traces the extent of the city at different periods, and how scrupulously and completely he worked over all available archaeological material to gain a basis for his conclusions.



He was able to study the *collezione Cumana* in the light of his own excavations (made in 1908). In the fifty tombs uncovered he found all the periods of Cumae's history represented: first, Roman tombs of the last two centuries of the republic and the first period of the empire; lower, cradle and coffin tombs with Cumaeian pottery; below these the parallelopipeds with bronze kettles and Attic vases, which are associated with the rite of incineration and precede the Samnite conquest; lowest of all the trench tombs.

The two volumes of beautiful plates which illustrate Gàbrici's work bring before our eyes the weapons, the fibulae, the bronze utensils, the pottery, and the glass found at Cumae and vivify her history as intensely as does Dionysius' or Livy's narrative.

## THE CLASSICS AND THE GREEK WRITERS OF THE EARLY CHURCH: SAINT BASIL<sup>1</sup>

BY ROY J. DEFERRARI  
University of Pittsburgh

The purpose of this paper is to serve as a reminder of the close bond which exists between the masters of classical literature and many of the early Christian writers and to emphasize the great value in studying at least certain of the church authors for the acquirement of the fullest understanding of the great minds of antiquity. At the same time we would warn against an over-accentuation of classical elements in the products of later periods and the consequent lack of appreciation of the true value and place of the post-classical in the history of civilization.

St. Basil the Great, of Caesarea, is an excellent example of the Christian Father, a study of whom is very compensating to the classicist. He lived in a period (the fourth century) when the elements of Christianity and pagan life were most closely united. Theodosius the First had made Christianity the state religion, and paganism was from that time on to suffer constant persecution and gradual extermination. Christianity, which had hitherto been fighting desperately for its very existence, and had thus been averse to any principle of life in any way reminiscent of paganism, now, in a feeling of security, readily took over many of the pagan elements of the older civilization. This reaction, as one would expect, is reflected strongly in the literature of the period. It seems, indeed, like one of the ironies of history that scarcely had the church begun to triumph when paganism began to make greater and greater inroads, not only into the literature, but also into the customs, thoughts, and life of the people.

<sup>1</sup> A paper delivered at the meeting of the American Philological Association at the University of Pennsylvania, December 28, 1917.

The earliest literary productions of Christianity show very little contact with Hellenism, and in form are almost entirely independent, with some Jewish and oriental influences.<sup>1</sup> The Apocalypse is the only early Christian literary composition which has a foreign source, and this is Jewish.

From this earliest period down to Clement of Alexandria (latter part of the second century) is the time of transition from a literature hostile to all culture and everything worldly to a literature influenced by a very careful Hellenistic training. The literary products of the third and fourth centuries show the closest contact with Hellenism without lacking at the same time every quality of originality. Not only do we see very marked Hellenistic influences, but we find open declarations of the high value of the classics,<sup>2</sup> and accompanying this we notice a correspondingly high level of culture. Basil is one of the foremost authors of this patristic *floruit*.

It is very noteworthy that the older Greek Fathers, in explaining the nature of the Holy Ghost, had recourse to Platonic formulae, particularly to the doctrine of the soul of the universe (*ἡ τοῦ νοητοῦ κόσμου ψυχὴ*). It has been observed that Origen made use of the theory in describing the Holy Spirit,<sup>3</sup> and Gregory Nazianzus<sup>4</sup> frankly compares this idea with the Christian doctrine of the Holy Ghost. Basil also makes free use of these formulae in his work on the Holy Spirit (*περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*), so much so that an effort has been made to establish a direct relation between this treatise and the writings of Plotinus.<sup>5</sup> Although the resemblances in thought are striking and numerous, it is difficult to establish any direct dependency. The arguments contained therein were gen-

<sup>1</sup> E.g., the Epistles to the Hebrews and the so-called first letter of St. Clement show a strong rhetorical and slightly stoical influence. Cf. P. Wendland, *Christentum und Hellenismus in ihren litterarischen Beziehungen* (Leipzig, 1902); E. Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1909), II, 460; E. Hatch, *Griechentum und Christentum* (Freiburg, 1892).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Jerome, *Ad magnum oratorem*; Basil, *Homily on Education* 3. 584 C7; *Epistles* 4. 1092 C10; 4. 572 C8.

<sup>3</sup> Baumgarten-Crusius, *Histor. Dogm. T.H.*, p. 1025.

<sup>4</sup> *Or.* 37.

<sup>5</sup> Jahnius, *Basilii Magnus Plotinizans* (Bernae, 1838); Carolus Gronau, *De Basilio, Gregorio Nazianzeno Nyssenoque Platonis Imitatoribus* (Goettingae, 1908).

erally known in Basil's time through the teachings of the popular philosophy and, as we have indicated, through the work of the earlier Christian Fathers. Basil therefore may be depending on the earlier Christian writers (e.g., Origen), or, what is more probable, on the current teachings of the neo-Platonists in general. Furthermore, since Basil's intimate acquaintance with Plato is very marked in some of his other works, it is not too rash to presume that here also he is drawing somewhat on the great master himself.

The influence of the popular diatribe is seen in the form of what are known as the longer and shorter rules for monks (*Ὅροι κατὰ πλάτος* and *Ὅροι κατ' ἐπιτομήν*). Both of these works are written in the regular diatribe form of question and answer, and are known as the *Monks' Catechism of Morals and Obligations*.

The work which best displays Basil's attitude toward the ancient classics is his address to Christian youths on the benefit to be derived from pagan literature (*λόγος πρὸς τοὺς νέους ὅπως ἀν ἐξ Ἑλληνικῶν ὠφελοῦντο λόγων*).<sup>1</sup> Life eternal, he says, is the supreme goal of every Christian, and Holy Writ is the guide to this life. Since young men cannot appreciate the deep thoughts contained therein, they should study the profane writings, in which truth appears as in a mirror. As leaves are a protection and an ornament to the fruit of a tree, so is pagan wisdom to Christian truth. In reading pagan literature one must distinguish between the morally helpful and the morally injurious. Since the life eternal is to be obtained through virtue, one must pay particular attention to those passages in which virtue is praised—such examples as may be found in Hesiod, Homer, Solon, Theognis, and Prodicus. Almost all eminent philosophers have extolled virtue, and we must try to realize their words in this life. Every man is divided against himself who does not make his life conform to his

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Georg Buettner, *Basileios des Grossen Mahnworte an die Jugend über nützlichen Gebrauch der heidnischen Literatur* (München, 1908); Shear, *The Influence of Plato on St. Basil* (Baltimore, 1906); Eichoff, *Zwei Schriften des Basilius und des Augustinus als geschichtliche Dokumente der Vereinigung von klassischer Bildung und Christentum*; de Vos, *De legendis gentiliū libris in scholastica adolescentium institutione quid sit sentiendum, quid S. Basilius M. senserit* (Warendorf, 1855); Padelford, *Essays on the Study and Use of Poetry by Plutarch and Basil the Great* (New York, 1902).

words, but who says with Euripides, "The mouth indeed hath sworn, but the heart knows no oath."<sup>1</sup> To seem to be good when one is not so is, if we are to respect the opinion of Plato<sup>2</sup> at all, the very height of injustice. In pagan literature virtue is praised in deeds as well as in words, wherefore one should study the acts of noble men which coincide with the teachings of the Scriptures—for example, the deeds of Pericles, Euclid, Socrates, Alexander, and Cleinias. The young man, then, in thought and action must never lose sight of his aim in life. Thus, like the athlete Polydamas and the musician Timotheus, he must bend every energy to one task, the winning of the heavenly crown. This end is to be obtained by freeing the soul from its association with the senses, by scorning riches and reputation, and by subordinating all else to virtue. This ideal will be matured later by the study of the Scriptures, but at present it is to be fostered by the study of the pagan writers. From these should be stored up knowledge for the future.

This résumé in itself tells much about Basil's knowledge of ancient classics. In addition, throughout the whole a strong Platonic influence is felt in the method of expression and in the development of the theme. As often, it is difficult to distinguish between the influence of popular philosophy and a direct relationship with Plato. In certain portions, however, the resemblance to Plato is too marked to admit of doubt—for example, in the early part of the address, where Basil, in considering the merits and demerits of the poets, is clearly basing his remarks on Plato's *Republic* 376 E ff. Plutarch's *πῶς δεῖ τὸν νέον ποιημάτων ἀκοῦειν* bears many similarities to Basil's work, not so much in content as in methods of argument. Any connection with Basil, however, is probably very slight, as in these cases of likeness we have to do with *topoi* which may have a common source in the popular philosophy of the time.

Basil's homilies show the most evident dependence on the classics. The *Hexaameron*, a series of nine sermons on Genesis, is strikingly influenced by the *Timaeus* of Plato and the *Historia animalium* of Aristotle, colored here and there by reminiscences

<sup>1</sup> Hippolytus 612.

<sup>2</sup> *Rep.* ii. 361.



of Origen and Philo.<sup>1</sup> The very statement of the subject recalls the *Timaeus*. It is a treatise *περὶ φύσεως*<sup>2</sup> just as the *Timaeus* is said to be.<sup>3</sup> To mention only a few of the most important parallels: both Basil and Plato say that God bound the elements together by a bond of friendship;<sup>4</sup> the universe is visible and tangible, and the visibility is due to fire, the tangibility to the hardness of the earth.<sup>5</sup> The last parallelism has a remarkable similarity in phraseology. Other parallels in phraseology as well as in thought are the statements that God kindled the sun and made it of sufficient brightness to shine on the whole universe;<sup>6</sup> the commonplaces on the division of time;<sup>7</sup> the expressions about the origin of flesh;<sup>8</sup> and the respiration of fish.<sup>9</sup> An attempt has been made<sup>10</sup> to show that for the most part Basil made use of Posidonius' commentary on Plato's *Timaeus*. This is only partially true, as the outstanding resemblances cannot be explained simply by the study of a mere commentary.

This dependence on Plato is found to the greatest extent in the first four sermons, which treat especially of the creation of the universe in contrast to the formation of creatures. After a consideration in the next two homilies of the nature of the universe and the question of the divisions of time, Basil proceeds to the formation of creatures, discussing respectively the creeping things, the creatures of the air, the creatures of the waters, and the creatures of the land. In those questions, which are treated in the last three homilies, Basil's chief source is Aristotle's *περὶ ζώων*.<sup>11</sup> Basil did not make use of the discussions of Genesis which were written before his time, as the preserved fragments of these works show no connection with Basil whatsoever. Some assert an influence

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Shear, *loc. cit.*; Robbins, *The Hexaemeral Literature* (Chicago, 1912); Plass, *De Basilii et Ambrosii excerptis ad historiam animalium pertinentibus*; Müllenhoff, "Aristoteles bei Basilios," *Hermes*, II, 252; Jahn, *Neue Jahrb.*, XLIX, 397; Hiller, *Neue Jahrb.*, CIX., 174.

<sup>2</sup> Bas. I. 8A1.

<sup>3</sup> *Tim.* 27A.

<sup>4</sup> *Tim.* 32C; Bas. 33A.

<sup>5</sup> *Tim.* 31B; Bas. I. 25 A14.

<sup>6</sup> *Tim.* 39B; Bas. 137B.

<sup>7</sup> *Tim.* 39B; Bas. 137B.

<sup>8</sup> *Tim.* 82C; Bas. 168A.

<sup>9</sup> *Tim.* 92A; Bas. 149B.

<sup>10</sup> Gronau, *loc. cit.*

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Müllenhoff and Plass, *loc. cit.*

from the *Physiologus*. Kraus,<sup>1</sup> however, convincingly dates the *Physiologus* at the end of the fourth century or after Basil's time, and Plass (*loc. cit.*) sees no resemblance striking enough to warrant the slightest idea of dependency. An examination of the two works reveals many passages which have been taken almost verbatim from Aristotle, many which Basil saw fit to expand or curtail, and others which Basil enlarged by adding information from other sources, Aelian and Oppian.<sup>2</sup>

The influence which Philo and Origen exerted on Basil's *Hexameron* has been summarized thus:

Basil probably derived from Philo directly or indirectly the reason why the luminaries were not created until the fourth day, and the notion that both birds and fish swim. Both likewise speak of underground veins of water, and Basil evidently refers to Philo and his school when he says that certain Jews assert that the plural verb in the command "let us make man" signifies that the angels are addressed.<sup>3</sup>

It is difficult to tell how much Basil drew from Origen, because so much of the work of the latter has been lost. It is generally supposed, however, that in asserting so firmly his belief that the upper waters are real water, and rejecting an allegorical interpretation of the passage, Basil directs his arguments against Origen, with whom allegory was a favorite method of exegesis.<sup>4</sup> Basil owes many of his arguments against astrology to Origen, and the idea that it is impious to assert that God is ever inactive is common to Origen and Basil.<sup>5</sup>

The homilies on the psalms are naturally of a more popular nature. If it is true that Basil composed these sermons extempore,<sup>6</sup> we cannot doubt that he poured forth his mind with perfect freedom

<sup>1</sup> *Geschichte der christlichen Kunst* (Freiburg, 1896).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. (a) Basil 149A; Aristotle (Aristotelis opera ed. Acad. Reg. Borussica Berolini) 754a, 21: B. 152C; A. 675a, 3 and 675a, 5: B. 152C, 5; A. 591a, 7 and 22 and 25: B. 157B; A. 601b, 16 and 598b, 3: B. 169B; A. 486a, 23: B. 172B; A. 487b, 33: B. 180A; A. 563b, 7, etc.; (b) Basil 149A; Aristotle 489a, 35: B. 149B; A. 479b, 8: B. 177A; A. 542b, 4: D. 184D; A. 541b, 9, etc.; (c) Basil 149D; Aristotle 566b, 16; Oppian *De piscat.* 1. 734: B. 153C; A. 622a, 8; O. ii. 233: B. 180A; A. 756a, 15 and 539a, 30; Aelian (ed. R. Hercher), p. 35, 22, etc.

<sup>3</sup> *Hex.* 205B; *De op. mund.* 25. 17.

<sup>4</sup> *Hex.* 76A; Origen, *Hom. in Gen.* 148A.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Origen, *De prin.* iii. 5. 3; Basil 32B; Philo 2. 12. The quotation is from Robbins, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Fialon, *Étude littéraire et historique sur St. Basile* (Paris, 1869), p. 183.

on every topic. Thus it is only natural that we should find that in these sermons Basil did not excerpt from any particular author, but spoke sentiments which were the composite product of his training in the schools of rhetoric and his studies in the ancient pagan and later Christian authors.

Homily VI (*Εἰς τὸ ῥητὸν τοῦ κατὰ Λουκᾶν εὐαγγελίου καὶ περὶ πλεονεξίας*, M 31. 262-78) is such a composition. Although many passages therein agree with certain sentiments of the Cynics and Stoics, it does not follow that Basil leaned to their teachings. Such passages have their source in the popular philosophy of the day.

Homily VII (*πρὸς τοὺς πλουτοῦντας*, M 31. 278 ff.) bears very manifest traces of Plutarch and Clement of Alexandria. The parallelism between this sermon and Plutarch's *περὶ φιλοπλουτίας* and Clement's *Paedagogus* are so close that we suspect that Basil read these works very shortly before he delivered his talk. Starting out with the words of the Scripture (Matt., chap. 19) he mingles his own sentiments with the words of a Christian and a pagan.

Basil's homily on Psalm 14 (*κατὰ τοκιζόντων*, M 29. 264 ff.) bears a very close resemblance to Plutarch's *περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖ δανείζεσθαι*.<sup>1</sup> As in Homily VII, the resemblances are so close that Basil must have read Plutarch's work but a short time previously.

Homily XXI (*περὶ τοῦ μὴ προσηλωσθαι τοῖς βιωτικοῖς*, M 31. 539 ff.) has very marked indications of being an extempore speech. All the sentiments of this sermon are met with in others of Basil's works. Expressions from the Cynic and Stoic, Plato, Plutarch, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, are all woven together into a composite mass.

In the field of epistolography Basil stands out as one of the leading writers of Greek literature. He has left us a group of vigorous letters of high literary value, a mine of information for the life of the times. In these private communications it is impossible to trace any direct connection with another author, except where occasionally a letter on some theological question develops into a small treatise. In such cases Basil presents views necessarily influenced in part by the earlier Christian Fathers. Yet

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. Jahn, *Animadversiones in St. Basilii opera*, fasc. 1. *Accadunt emblemata Plutarchea ex Basilii homilia in Ps. XIV* (Bern. 1842).

Basil's training in the classics and in schools of rhetoric is everywhere apparent if only in his manner of expression. Furthermore, he makes many allusions to classical authors and subjects. In Letter I he speaks of passing the city on the Hellespont more unmoved than any Ulysses passing Sirens' songs.<sup>1</sup> In Letter LXXIV he says: "Not then would I pray that I might listen to you, like Alcinous to Ulysses, only for a year, but throughout all my life." In Letter CCXXXIX Basil quotes Homer directly: "I am moved to say as Diomed said—"

'Would God, Atrides, thy request were yet to undertake,  
... he's proud enough.'"<sup>2</sup>

In Letter III Basil mentions Plato (*Rep.* vi. 10): "You do not give up the study of literature, but, as Plato has it, in the midst of the storm and tempest of affairs, you stand aloof, as it were, under some strong wall, and keep your mind clear of all disturbances."<sup>3</sup> Anecdotes apparently taken from Plutarch occur about Demosthenes in Letter III,<sup>4</sup> and about Solon in Letter LXXIV.<sup>5</sup> Other echoes from classical antiquity may be seen in Letters IV, VIII, XIV, XXI, XXXIX, CXXXIII, CXII, CCXCI, and CCCXXXIX. These references are by no means all that exist in Basil's letters, but only a small portion collected at random.

In touching upon Basil's language there is need of great caution. We classicists are very apt to forget that elementary principle of philology which declares that language, totally distinct from literature, experiences no rise and decline, but ever changes and develops. Consequently we often erroneously speak of the quality and purity of a writer's Greek, of a decline in the use of moods, etc. However, if we may compare Basil's Greek with that which we know as Attic, we can say that the resemblance is very close.

<sup>1</sup> Hom. *Od.* xii. 158.

<sup>2</sup> *IL* ix. 694-95 (Chapman). Hom. *III.* 346 is quoted in Letter CCCXLVIII, but the authenticity of this letter is questioned.

<sup>3</sup> Plato is mentioned in Letter CCCXLVIII, but the genuine character of this letter is questioned.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Plut. *πολ. παραγγ.* xxii.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Plut. *Solon* 30. Note reference to Alexander from Plutarch's Alexander in doubtful Letter CCLXXII.

Certain words, to be sure, bear a slightly different meaning. There is a tendency to make a minimum use of the moods. Yet the differences on the whole are very slight.<sup>1</sup> Since he was born in Cappadocian Caesarea, the son of a worthy rhetor and lawyer, trained by his father from the beginning in rhetorical studies, and then for several years taught in the University at Athens, it is difficult to understand how Basil could write anything but Greek, very closely resembling the classical.

In a literary way, then, Basil belongs to those Church Fathers in whom classical culture and Christianity are most closely united. He is well read in profane literature and knows how to employ his wide reading fittingly. He has an intimate first-hand knowledge of Aristotle and Plutarch, but is especially well acquainted with Plato, particularly the *Republic*. The popular philosophical tracts of the Cynics, a long rhetorical training, and a careful study of the earliest Christian Fathers have all shown their influence on Basil. His theology is colored by Platonic and Stoic ideas. As for his language, he unconsciously rather than consciously follows the method of the second Sophistic in imitating Attic as his norm. Although Basil may not have appreciated the importance of classical culture in all its phases, he did recognize in it a lasting and imperishable worth for the cultivation of men's minds, and he did much to preserve the intellectual product of Hellenic culture for later generations.

Aside from the literary and purely theological and ecclesiastic interest which Basil's writings possess, we cannot pass over a value which has never been fully recognized. Indeed we may make the same statement about the voluminous writings of his brother Gregory of Nyssa and his friend Gregory of Nazianzen. They possess great worth as storing up many facts about the condition of society and education in the late Roman Empire, about the administration and law as practically affecting the people, about the taxpayer's views on taxation, the traveler's views as to the roads and the seasons, the householder's views on the safety of his property, the merchant's and the investor's views on the public credit, and the standard of commercial honesty—in short, about

<sup>1</sup> Cf. J. Trunk, *De Basilio Magno sermonis Attici imitatore* (Stuttgart, 1911).



the ordinary life of a highly organized community, in which the original style of society and manners was being replaced by the European. Above all, however, these writings show us the views entertained by a man of power and education as to the duties of the church in its relation to all these various interests.<sup>1</sup>

In spite of the close ties which unite the Greek authors of antiquity with the early Greek writers of the church, classicists have been in the past and are to a great extent in the present averse to studying the classical heritage of the early church. They have thereby failed to grasp a very important phase of their study of the masters of earlier times, i.e., their influence in the course of the ages.

Men of the church have always pored over Greek and Latin Christian literature, but only as the source of their theology. Classicists, on the other hand, have thrown them hastily aside as containing nothing but information for the theologian. The result has been that the literature and civilization of a very extensive part of the world's history has been very much neglected by the very ones best able to investigate it. We are still, especially here in America, under the influence of that linguistic reaction which dates back to the Atticists of the first century, was taken up again in the twelfth century by the Humanists at Byzantium, and was renewed in Greece during the last century by the creators of our modern "ancient" Greek. There have been some notable exceptions, however, and these men of the highest scholarship, e.g., L. Parmentier, F. Cumont, W. B. Bury, W. M. Ramsay, W. M. Lindsay, P. Lejay, T. Mommsen, H. Usener, W. Christ, etc.

In the very practical matter of text criticism the classicists may obtain much assistance from the later literature. The solution of many a corrupt passage in a writer of antiquity is to be found in the works of his Christian admirer and imitator.<sup>2</sup>

Classicists shrink from making a special study of the language of the late periods. They reproach it for its barbarity, coarseness,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. W. M. Ramsay, "Basil of Caesarea," *Expositor*, January, 1896, pp. 49-61 (a criticism of Jackson's translation of St. Basil's letters).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Shear, *op. cit.*, p. 45; Ubaldi, *Revista di filologia et d'istruzione classica*, XXVIII (1900), 69-75.

incorrectness, lack of rules, its poverty, its strange words, and its supposed absence of unity.<sup>1</sup> All these reproaches of course denote an insufficient familiarity with the life of a natural language, an imperfect knowledge of the laws of development in written languages, a lack of information about the history of other literatures and other languages. All arguments against the late or vulgar Greek come from the erroneous idea that the ancient literature is the absolute ideal for all time. Because ancient literature, or, better, a part of this literature, attained its highest artistic perfection and, so far as we can judge, an imperishable value, they conclude that the same must be true of the linguistic form of this literature.

We speak of the absence of rules because certain forms present dialectic fluctuations and because the system of grammar and orthography has not yet been catalogued as conveniently, paragraph for paragraph, as in the ancient language, and we do not stop to think that the beautiful paragraphs of the school grammar of the ancient Greek often include very imaginary and arbitrary treasures. In reality, in no living language do incorrect forms exist in the sense in which this word is used by the purist. That which the pedant calls incorrect is inseparable from the life of a language. It is the necessary salt for the renewal of its essence that it may eliminate substances which have become inconvenient or useless and develop new forces—in a word, create new language.

We reproach late Greek writers particularly for their use of strange words. Would that they had used many more, for the obscurity of a Procopius or of an Anna Comnena is due to their great reluctance to employ foreign words for matters which did not exist and accordingly possessed no precise terminology in ancient times. Indeed, under the Atticist reaction, spontaneity and sincerity gave way to frigid artificiality. Judging from the history of other languages and literatures, if the Christian and later Greek writers had continued under their earlier spirit of independence and had not fallen back under the old restraint of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Karl Krumbacher, "Le Problème de la langue littéraire néo-Grecque," *Revue des Études Grecques*, XVI, 246 ff.

Atticism, they would have been able to bequeath to the world a far greater number of genuine literary products.

The language of the later periods should be studied with as great care as that of the classical periods for the sake of its historical importance. What in the course of time was the development of the classical language, and in what way did the various archaizing tendencies affect the natural course of its life?

This claim for the importance of historical continuity must not be confined to language alone. Homer, Sophocles, Plato, Vergil, and Cicero are eternal. An isolated study and contemplation of these great minds is far from complete. They come much nearer to us. They partake of life to a far greater degree when we try to appreciate their place in the continuous history of the ages.<sup>1</sup> We must separate our ideas of aesthetic pleasure and pedagogic usefulness from that of scientific investigation. The philological bureaucrat who would limit his studies to a circle of recognized works determined by a higher authority must realize that the investigation of a truth in the fourth century B.C. is of no more importance than the discovery of a truth from the twelfth century A.D.

Of course we would not in the least belittle the aesthetic and pedagogic value of the classics, and would not think of replacing them with anything else, but if we would measure the right of an investigation according to aesthetic and pedagogic standards alone, and would deny the sole purpose of knowledge, then very little remains for research. It is a matter not of material but of mankind.

When a classicist investigates post-classical periods, he must be very careful not to overemphasize the ancient elements which he discovers. Nothing has done greater harm to the deeper understanding and proper valuation of the later periods than this one-sided estimation. The unbroken continuity of the classical tradition may be the classicist's main reason for studying later Greek literature, but for the sake of truth he should not allow this interest to overcome the value and importance which the later Greek world possesses in itself.

<sup>1</sup> No one can deny that Cicero appears in a much more intimate and important light since the appearance of Zielinski's work, *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte* (Leipzig, 1908).

If we classicists only possess this proper historical interest in our private investigations, regardless of whether or not we make any extensive study in a later period, if we would only keep the aesthetic and pedagogic in their proper places, and emphasize the classics more as the fountainhead of modern culture and the dominating influence of much that was good in the course of the ages, we should undoubtedly strengthen our present precarious position in the world, and perhaps unconsciously benefit our spirit in the classroom.

We may thank Atticism that the later world learned to treasure this costly heritage of antiquity, but we have also to thank it for the ruin of Hellenistic literature and for the spell of classicism under which we all have labored more or less, and from which science, historical, literary, and lingual, has lately begun to free itself.

## GLIMPSES OF ROMAN LIFE AS IT IS REVEALED TO US IN THE LITERATURE<sup>1</sup>

BY CHARLES CHRISTOPHER MIEROW  
Colorado College

Latin, as you all know, is a dead language:

All the people dead who spoke it,  
All the people dead who wrote it,  
All the people die who learn it,  
Blessed death: they earn it!

But there are degrees, even of deadness. Old Marley (of blessed memory) was as dead as a doornail. Latin has rather suffered a sea-change into something rich and strange. Its bones have been made into the coral of the Romance languages. It is as dead as the English of Alfred or of Chaucer, and it is as much alive as is our mother-tongue—though to be sure it has changed its name and grown younger. Roumanian, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, French—these are some of the guises in which it masquerades today: living, growing, changing, modern languages, but still 90 per cent Latin. What of the speech of the old Romans: of Terence and of Cicero, of Caesar and of Pliny? That tongue is as dead as we choose to make it. The effect that Latin had has in molding our own language and literature is only one of the many ways in which we still feel the living presence of the city on the Tiber.

But how real to you are the men and women of Caesar's day? Do you look upon them as mere historical personages, or as creatures of flesh and blood like yourselves, human beings who were born, and lived, and loved, and suffered, and died? Do the official motion pictures of "The Battle on the Somme" and other great struggles of the present war bring to your minds the thousands upon thousands—Gauls and Romans alike—who perished on these same plains twenty centuries ago? Perhaps the commentaries on

<sup>1</sup> Read before the Classical Section of the Colorado Education Association at the annual meeting in Denver, November 1, 1917.



the Gallic War would take on a new meaning if we were to take down the dusty volume from the shelf some afternoon and read again the story of those far-distant campaigns. Read it as *history*, and with an eye to the human side of it: the Roman soldiers on the night before the battle engaged in drawing up their wills (I. 39); the brave standard-bearer who leaped from his ship into the waves that dash against the coast of Britain crying (IV. 25): "Jump, comrades, unless you want your flag to fall into the enemy's hands; I at least will do my duty to my country and my commander"; read again of the 368,000 Helvetians who set out from their own land looking for a place in the sun, only to come back—110,000 of them—to dwell again in their own land with room enough and to spare. It is a great story, and one no longer appreciated as it deserves:

But yesterday the word of Caesar might  
Have stood against the world: now lies he there,  
And none so poor to do him reverence.

It is, after all, this personal element in history that makes the events of past ages seem real to us today. "One touch of nature makes the whole world kin," and when Suetonius, the biographer of the twelve Caesars, tells us that the great Julius had dark and flashing eyes, and that of all the honors decreed him by the senate there was none he appreciated more than the privilege of always wearing a laurel wreath—because it concealed his baldness—when we read incidents like these the great men of Rome take on new life and interest; they become almost human!

Latin will mean much more to our pupils if we give them at least occasional glimpses of Roman life as it is revealed to us in the literature. I do not mean any definite and orderly treatment of the subject, although that method has its advantages. One of our illustrious predecessors, the great teacher Quintillian, "starts the orator at his cradle and finishes him up"; that is, he gives a detailed account of the early training, education, and proper reading of one who wishes to qualify as an orator. In like manner it would be quite possible for us to take a hypothetical Roman youth, and proceeding from the day of his birth we might supervise his childish games, order his education for him, marry him off to some rich and

noble maiden, start him gloriously on an honorable career, and finally kill him off—by poison or otherwise—in order to be interested spectators at the funeral and read the inscription on his tomb. Such literary crimes have been perpetrated heretofore. There is a very valuable book, entitled *Gallus*, which does this very thing. But there is, after all, a certain artificiality about this method of presentation, and, moreover, the tendency is to stress points of difference, to bring out the typical customs of the Ciceronian or of the Augustan age, the passing fashions of a day, and thereby to obscure the fundamental sameness of life then as now. If we would really know our Roman friends of those bygone years, let us casually look in upon them and see how they spend their time when free from official duties.

Fortunately a number of them have given us glimpses of themselves that are very enlightening. We shall let them speak for themselves as far as possible. I have often felt that it is unfortunate that some of the *Letters* of Pliny are not part of the ordinary high-school course in Latin, for Pliny is an extremely likable person in spite of his rather pompous manner and the high regard in which he held himself and his own attainments. His letters are a great fund of information, not only on the life of his time, but on the likes and dislikes of a Roman gentleman of the Empire, his idiosyncracies, and his avocations. He says (IX. 36):

You ask me how I spend my time in summer on my Tuscan estate. I get up when I please, usually at about sunrise, often before, rarely later; the windows remain closed. For I am remarkably safeguarded by the silence and darkness from the things which distract, and being left free and to myself I do not follow my eyes with my mind, but my mind with my eyes, which behold the same things as the mind does whenever they do not see other things. [That is, Pliny is more able to visualize his thoughts when his attention is not distracted by the passing sights of the out-of-door world.] I think, if I have any work on hand, and I think as though I were actually writing and making corrections, now more, now less, according to the relative difficulty or ease of composition and memory. I call my secretary and, admitting the daylight, dictate what I have composed: he goes away, is again recalled, and again dismissed. At ten or eleven o'clock (for the time is not definitely mapped out) I betake myself, according to the weather, either to the garden or to my covered portico and think and dictate further. I get into my carriage. There, too, I do exactly as when walking or lying down. For my concentration of mind is

strengthened by the change, and continues. I sleep a little, then walk; presently I read a Greek or Latin speech clearly and with expression, not so much for the sake of my voice as of my digestion; yet my voice, too, is strengthened. I walk again, am anointed, exercise, bathe. While I dine, if I am with my wife or only a few friends, a book is read. After dinner there is a recitation or music. Then I walk with my friends, among whom there are men of learning. And so the evening is spent in varied conversation and, however long the day, it is quickly laid to rest. Sometimes there are certain changes in this order of things. For, if I have slept or walked a long time I do not take a carriage ride after dining and reading, but ride on horseback, which takes less time, as it is swifter. My friends from the near-by towns come in and claim part of the day for themselves, and sometimes when I am tired they come with a timely interruption. Occasionally I hunt, but not without my notebook, so that, although I may have caught nothing, I may still bring something back. My tenants are given—as it seems to them—not enough time, and their rustic complaints give greater zest to my literary work and my duties in the city. Farewell.

Pliny, you see, was consciously imitating the life of his strenuous uncle, of whose tireless activity he gives us an interesting account in another letter (III. 5). This is scarcely to be taken, then, as a typical Roman's day. It is the way a conscientious literary man of the Empire spent his time in the country during the summer vacation. Pliny was a lawyer, you remember, and his professional duties kept him busy when the courts were in session. His wife, Calpurnia, was devoted to her husband and took a deep interest in his work. In IV. 19 Pliny says:

She has my books, reads them repeatedly, even learns them by heart. What anxiety she feels when I am about to speak in court; what joy when I have spoken! She appoints persons to tell her what assent, what applause, I have aroused; what result I have obtained in the case. Whenever I give a public reading she sits near by behind a curtain and drinks in my praises with eager ears. She sings my poems and even sets them to music herself, with no artist to instruct her but love—which is the best teacher.

Calpurnia's devotion seems to have been appreciated and reciprocated, as witness the following love-letter written in the first century A.D. (VII. 5):

Gaius Plinius to his Calpurnia, Greeting:

It is remarkable how much I miss you. The reason is first of all our love; then, too, the fact that we have not been accustomed to be separated. That

is why I lie awake a great part of the night thinking of you. That is why, in the daytime, at the hours when I was accustomed to go to see you, my feet lead me of their own accord—as is most truthfully said—to your room; why I finally leave your empty threshold sick at heart and sorrowful, like one shut out. The only time free from this misery is that at which I am being worn out in the Forum in the lawsuits of my friends. Consider what my life is, you who are its rest in labor, its solace in anxiety and care. Farewell.

Pliny was a man to whom the excitement and bustle of the city were distasteful. His culture and refinement enabled him to find the truest delight in the seclusion of his country estates, where his books, the beauty of natural surroundings, and pleasant intercourse with his friends were a constant source of deep satisfaction. Doubtless there were many others in his own time and in preceding ages whose tastes were in accord with his. In one of his letters (I. 9) Pliny comments on the contrast between city and country life:

It is strange what a good account we can give, or think we can give, of each separate day spent in the city, whereas in the case of several successive days this is impossible. For if you ask someone, "What have you done today?" he may reply: "I was present at a coming of age, I have attended a betrothal or a wedding, so and so asked me to witness his will, such an one to support him in court, and yet another to give him advice." Now on the day that you did these things they seemed necessary; but if you recall having done them every day they seem insignificant, and much more so when you have withdrawn into the country. For then the thought comes to one, "How many days I have wasted, and on what trivial matters!" That is what happens to me on my Laurentine estate, whenever I either write or read something, or even attend to my physical comfort, for by care of the body the mind is sustained. I hear nothing which I am sorry I heard, say nothing I regret having said. Nobody in my presence slanders anyone. I rebuke no one, except myself for writing poorly. I am troubled by no hope or fear, I am disquieted by no gossip; I speak only to myself and my books. O how real and genuine a life; how charming and honorable a leisure, almost more delightful than any manner of work! O sea, O shore, true and secret home of the Muses, how many thoughts you inspire, how many you dictate! Accordingly, do you too forsake that uproar, that useless rushing to and fro, these very foolish labors, as soon as you possibly can, and give yourself over to study or to leisure. For—as our friend Atilius has remarked very profoundly and at the same time wittily—it is a great deal better to have nothing to do than to be busy doing nothing. Farewell.

This happy, sheltered life of ease stands out in sharp contrast to the bitterness and hardship that fell to the lot of another literary

man reared like Pliny in wealth and luxury, the poet Ovid. He is, however, a man of far different temperament. His early years in Rome had been spent in the whirl of excitement and pleasure of court life under Augustus. To him the world's capital was the only place in which it was worth while to live. Try to picture, if you can, the despair that must have fallen upon him during those last years of his life, when at the age of fifty he was banished to the Thracian wilds alone and friendless: "If any one there still remembers Naso who was taken from your midst," he writes from exile (*Tristia* III. 10), "and my name without me still survives in the City, let him know that I live in the midst of barbarians under stars that never set in the ocean." Not only the loss of his friends and all that he held dear but the actual physical contrast between the magnificence of Rome and the hideousness of his primitive surroundings on the desolate shores of the Black Sea profoundly affected the poet's sensitive nature. Naturally his depression was greater in times of sickness. Here is an extract from one of his mournful letters to his wife (*Tristia* III. 3):

If perhaps you wonder why this letter is written by another's hand, I am sick; sick on the farthest shores of an unknown world, and almost without hope of recovery. What do you suppose are my feelings as I lie in this dread country among the Sarmatians and the Getae? I cannot endure the climate, I am not used to the water, and the land itself somehow does not please me. There is no house here and no food that is suitable for a sick man; none to relieve my sufferings by Apollo's art, none to console me, no friend to beguile with stories the slowly passing days. Exhausted, I lie amid the farthest peoples and places, and in my illness there appears before me all that I have lost. And while everything comes to my thoughts, yet you, my wife, outweigh all the rest, and hold more than a place in my heart. I speak to you though you are absent; it is you alone whom my voice names. No night and no day comes without you. They even say that in my delirium it was ever your name that was on my lips. Were I to lie at the point of death, my tongue pressing against the roof of my mouth and scarcely to be revived by a drop of wine, let someone but announce that my wife had come, and I should arise; the hope of you would be a source of new strength.

Cicero, too, was banished from Rome, you remember, but he was fortunate enough to be recalled after an absence of a year and a half (March 58—September 57 B.C.). Here is his well-



known account of one of the happiest days of his life (*Ad Atticum* IV. 1):

I reached Brundisium on the fifth of August. There was my little Tullia to meet me on her birthday, which happened to be also the anniversary of the founding of the colony of Brundisium and of your near-by Temple of Safety. The coincidence was noticed by the crowd and celebrated with the heartiest congratulations of the people of Brundisium. On the eighth of August I learned from a letter of Quintus' that the bill had been passed in the *comitia centuriata* with unusual interest on the part of men from all Italy. After that I set out on my way, so honored by the worthy citizens of Brundisium that delegates came to me from all sides with congratulations. My entry into the city was such that no man of any station known to my name-slave failed to meet me, except those enemies who could not conceal or deny the fact that they were my enemies. When I had come to the *Porta Capena*, the steps of the temples were crowded from top to bottom with the people, and when their congratulations had been made known to us by the greatest applause, a like throng and demonstration accompanied me to the Capitol, and in the Forum and the Capitol itself there was an enormous gathering of people.

There was a shortage of grain at the time when Cicero returned to Rome, and it seemed expedient to appoint a food dictator. There is a strangely modern sound to Cicero's account of what was done (*Ad Att.* IV. 1): The consuls proposed a law whereby Pompey was to be given entire control over the grain supply of the whole world for five years.

Graphic pictures of the Roman populace in holiday attire may also be found in the extant literature. The Italian prototype of our World's Series baseball games may perhaps be discovered in the enormous crowds that flocked to the Circus Maximus seventeen centuries ago. Ovid gives a poetic account of some races to which he took a young lady (*Amores* III. 2) and intersperses his description of the proceedings with remarks addressed to his neighbors in the bleachers: "You there on the right, whoever you are, have pity on the girl, she is being crushed by your pushing. Yes, and you too who sit behind us, draw your legs back if you have any politeness at all; don't push your hard knees into my back!" Elsewhere Ovid suggests that the way to obtain an introduction at the races is to brush the dust off your neighbor's dress; if there is no dust on it, brush it off just the same! (*A.A.* 149-151.)

These and similar selections from the literature of ancient Rome may serve to emphasize the fact that Caesar and Cicero and Pliny and Ovid had their weaknesses, their joys, and their sorrows—just like men and women of the present day. Needless to say, there are thousands of passages of this general nature scattered throughout the writings of the authors of classical antiquity whose works have come down to our own time. There are more of them, of course, in such books as the *Satires* of Horace, the *Letters* of Cicero and of Pliny, and the autobiographical poems of Ovid, but we may find glimpses of Roman life here and there in almost every Latin writer, side lights on the daily habits and occupations of the people, revelations of their feelings and emotions, their hopes and ambitions, that remind us of the words of the Preacher (Eccles. 1: 9-10): "That which hath been is that which shall be; and that which hath been done is that which shall be done: and there is no new thing under the sun. Is there a thing whereof it may be said, See, this is new? it hath been long ago, in the ages which were before us."

Andrew Lang has given beautiful expression to the thought which I have been trying to emphasize in this paper. He has said:

The great charm of all ancient literatures, one often thinks, is the finding of ourselves in the past. It is as if the fable of repeated and recurring lives were true; as if in the faith, or unbelief, or merriment, or despair, or courage, or cowardice, of men long dead, we heard the echoes of our own thoughts, and the beating of hearts that once were our own.

## VIRGIL AND APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE<sup>1</sup>

BY NORMAN W. DEWITT  
Victoria College, Toronto

In Rome we find little trace of a broad historical outlook before Virgil's time, and this is but natural, since the historic sense is born in the wake of world-movements and not in the van, and the prophet is the child of calamity rather than of triumph. We cannot be sure under these circumstances whether the divine Julius himself was quite aware whether his presence in Gaul was due to imperial prevision, to the spirit of the explorer and adventurer, to the pressing need of Gallic gold, or to the necessity of procuring immunity from epileptic seizures by active campaigning in the open air. Not a trace of the background of his thought has been left to us, and I am skeptical enough to believe that it possessed little background. From the wide erudition of Cicero we might hope for something more, but lawyers, professors, and textbook-makers are not members of inspired tribes, and Cicero was all of these. His outlook is egoistic, partisan, professional, and urban; he is a Tory and not a Liberal, a Jeremiah and not an Isaiah, a Don Quixote tilting against windmills, a classicist and not a romanticist; his eyes are blind to all far-off divine events and his vision myopic to all but the death struggles of an effete body politic whose vigor he essayed to restore by the transfusion of the rich and copious tide of his eloquence. Of dear and lovable Livy little need be said. He belongs in the same class with Sir Roger de Coverley, an amiable old gentleman with the added gift of the silver tongue, a white soul, fit to live with Virgil and Varius, nor can we doubt that his spirit dwells in Elysian fields. His history is a labor of love, a honeycomb of sentiment, and a sweet elegy for Rome, but the circle of Rome's walls is the circle of the world to him and no distant footsteps echo in his ears.

<sup>1</sup> Read at the meeting of the American Philological Association at the University of Pennsylvania, December 28, 1917.

It is Virgil alone who has gone up to the mountain tops and descended into the depths. So liberally did he share in the universal soul that his spirit overflows environment and his mind transcends accounting. Nourished in the same atmosphere as Catullus, the lovely lad that found no *Adriadne* to lead him through the labyrinth and gave his dear life to the Minotaur of Roman snobbery; drinking at the same spring that poisoned Lucretius, the most profoundly religious spirit that ever went astray; fed at the same table as Horace, the nightingale among the ravens, whose slender wings could never essay the flights of the swan, Virgil alone was able to send his soul out into the invisible through uncharted space to bring back to men strange inklings of teasing mysteries that never cease to puzzle and never cease to charm. The times cannot account for him nor surroundings explain him. The white lily draws its food from the same earth as the reddening rose, and the poppy's roots may nestle among the wheat, but wheat is wheat and poppies are poppies.

So Virgil is Virgil, and more we can hardly say. We may perhaps say of him that he was a romanticist and not a classicist, and we may say of a romanticist that he reaches out for a beauty and reality that never was on land or sea, while the classicist gathers and schools his powers to recover once more a beauty and reality with which human endeavor has already crowned itself. Cicero, the classicist, knew what he wanted; the models and patterns of his thought were as manifestly embodied in the art of Greece as his political ideals were fashioned upon the disjunct members of the Roman Republic. Lucretius, unlike Horace, has taken the oath of fidelity to a master whom he believes to be divine, and his conception of the highest good admits of definition both precise and sufficient. Livy is a man of dreams but not of visions. The divine Julius is a worshiper of destiny, a destiny as unswerving as the wall of the plumb line. Horace also sees too much of unaccountable chance in life to catch the vision of realms beyond the bourne of time and place. Virgil alone has caught the gleam of the Holy Grail.

It is not the hero Aeneas but the poet himself who is the exile of fate, tossing about on strange seas of thought alone, seeking a

promised land that forever retreats before him, a vagrant soul, a star unfixed from the firmament that trails a path of flame across the night. It is not the hero but the poet who goes down into the depths of hell through the dismal corridors of the dark to behold the radiant souls that wait their turn behind the lines to take their places on the firing line of life. It was his spirit that longed and yearned to find peace and contentment for itself in the contemplation of the past, in the fond memories of a Troy that had been; but he could not. No means of satisfaction that sage or poet had found or discovered in life could appease the hunger of his soul. Even at the last hour, when he lay panting on his couch in that fateful September at Brundisium, the sense of partial frustration came over him once more, the sensation of baffled effort, the conviction that life held a larger content than he had seized, had he been but spared to follow knowledge like a sinking star beyond the utmost bounds of human thought.

For picayune prophecy, for the sort of Sibylline oracle that gave confidence to Sulla and sent Lentulus into the Catilinarian conspiracy, for the vulgar thaumaturgist that struck awe into the hearts of the superstitious, for the Chaldean who fattened on the folly of peasant and prince, Virgil had only scorn and contempt. "Fie on the blindness of seers!" he exclaims as Dido is pictured with parted lips bending over the palpitating vitals of the victims. "Their heart is as fat as grease," he might say with the psalmist. "After the astounding event they prophesied," he cried as the random arrow of Acestes caught fire in the clouds. For the petty predictions that clustered about the name of Aeneas in the legends of the oracle-mongers he found no room in the *Aeneid*. If the Sibyl opens the future to him it must be an ample future. She must tell, not of a prosperous city-state, but of a happy world, of the order of the ages, of a glorious day that is coming, of an end of evil, of a savior descended from heaven itself. The Messianic Eclogue marks the emancipation of his spirit; it is vibrant with the thrill of the first flight of a soul that has found itself; it is the first draft of the *Aeneid*. The *Aeneid* itself is the Messianic Eclogue drawn to a larger scale. The enthusiastic dream of the youth finds its fulfilment in the sober heart of the man.



When thoughts like these are surging through the minds of men and the fierce light of insolent reason is beating upon the heavens, it is small wonder that the gods themselves are stimulated to strange activity; that Venus, leaving the lap of Mars, is moved to plan for the distant future and try her unaccustomed hand at the game of world-politics; that Juno, ceasing to hector her lord and master about late hours and gay company, decides to stake her all upon world-power or downfall; that even Vulcan becomes a prophet and perceives that the shield of Achilles will not fit the shoulders of Aeneas. For the simple-minded Greeks it was well enough to depict a gray-bearded jury listening to a murder trial, a gang of lusty pirates looting a peaceful town, a man with a wine-jug waiting at the end of a field for a lot of tipsy plowmen, a lad singing catchy songs in a grapery, a portly landlord with a stick presiding over a barbecue in a harvest field, and a picnic in ancient Crete. For the matter-of-fact Achaeans the slim theory of art for art's sake was sufficient, but the romantic Roman demanded meat. Larger ideas must be set in motion. The shield of Aeneas must have a meaning for time and eternity, the history of Rome be ordained from the beginning, empire prearranged and without end. Troy may become a mournful memory in the minds of men, but Rome must bequeath a more substantial legacy to mankind. The fall of the Republic is not the end. The fate of Ilium may fill the world with tears and life's tragedies touch the hearts of men, but Virgil's soul has gone down into the depths and has found light. The secret of the past has revealed the secret of the future, and he it is, and not Nestor, who knows the things that are, the things that have been, and the things that shall be. "Thine it shall be, remember, Roman, to rule the nations; these shall be thy arts, to lay upon men the way of peace, to show mercy to the conquered, to war down the proud." Tears for the fallen Troy, confident hope and unwavering faith for the sons of Quirinus.

Virgil must have drunk of some spring that goes unmentioned in Pauly-Wissowa, some waters of more potent virtue than his contemporaries knew. The high walls and snobbish exclusiveness of late Republican elegance and urbanity, even the longer radius and wider circumference of the Augustan circle, are not sufficient

to contain him or explain him. To some unknown shrine he must have found his way, at some mysterious altar he must have laid his gift, some very present god his prayer received. Else how can we put in his mouth the words of the psalmist, as we may, "I have more understanding than all my teachers. I understand more than the ancients"? To expect us to believe that the nine spinsters who flitted in muslin about the spring of Helicon had led him a merry chase over the heights of Parnassus; to say that a winged horse had taken him a mad gallop through the frigid empyrean; to insist that the wild maid of Cumae had panted prophecies into his favored ears, is as idle as to ask us to believe that Homeric Nestor understood the past, the present, and the future. Nestor was no prophet. He was merely a fortune-teller, and the only evidence of his proficiency lies in the doubtful word of Homer, babbling delightful wonder-tales to uncritical Greeks. Even Apollo, "augur Apollo," is a sorry prophet, more fit to furnish figures of speech to poetasters than to uplift a nation. From Delphi to Zion is a long, long way.

To solve the difficulty we have once more unearthed there is but little evidence. Livy is lacking save for the epitomes, and epitomes are about as satisfying as the disjunct members of a Christmas turkey, though even from these a trained paleontologist might reconstruct a bird with as much certainty as an expert text-mechanic could rebuild an author from the lacunae. Even if we had Livy, however, we should not have the history of the swarthy strangers that hived in the congested valleys and recesses of the seven hills, only of the nobles and nabobs who lived on their tops. Livy does mention plebeians, of course, but it is the subplebeians we should be interested in, the multitudes that came from the Nile, the Jordan, the Orontes, the Tigris, and the Euphrates. How abundant was this class in the slums of Rome in the last century of the Republic we may infer from the fact that already in the previous century they were a pest to landlords like the elder Cato. In these classes only a sociological historian would have interest, and Rome certainly never possessed a sociological historian. It is only in random references that we may hear of these undesirable aliens, cheats, frauds, swindlers, oracle-mongers, and poison experts.

Yet they were always present. The immigration laws were lax and decrees of banishment soon forgotten.

These oriental scoundrels had ideas, nevertheless. They had knowledge and could read and write. They could cast your horoscope as well as poison your rich uncle. It was they that knew the past, the present, and the future. They knew what was in the earth beneath and what was in the heaven above. The fate of the soul after death was their secret. For a consideration payable in advance they would even contract to show you how to obtain immortality. What do you imagine was the subject of conversation at the board of the old Cilician pirate as he and Virgil feasted on their unbought banquet? It was those amiable rascals, as we know, who first brought the story of Mithraism to Italy, a cult so rich in content that beside its mythology the skimpy legends of Rome seem like a Pompeian wall-painting beside the Sistine Chapel. Compared to the rich conceptions of that ancient and highly developed oriental religion, we know that the stateliest ceremonial of old Rome was about as spiritual as a historical pageant or a triumphal procession. If you prefer to think that the farmer-poet from the Mincius and the old pirate discussed nice problems of apiculture or fowl-brood, or the best method of forcing vegetables, we leave you to dwell on these sumptuous thoughts. We think differently and our faith transcends footnotes. We believe that Virgil, who stammered and suffocated in high society, was, like Charles Lamb, quite at home with rogues, with Syrian landladies and market-gardeners, and I believe he plied that old tar with wine and questions until he tired the sun with talking and sent him down the sky.

If you demand of us the footnotes, we retort that Virgil read much, and wrote less than two lines per day in twenty-five years; that poets above all men conceal the background of their thought; that oriental literature was issued cheaply and circulated clandestinely; that a work like the Septuagint version of the Old Testament would beyond doubt have been classified as Sibylline literature and was consequently subject to the censorship, which may account for the lack of specific mention of it in tradition; that perhaps one-quarter of one per cent of the whole literature, and none of the

cheap literature, has survived. The Jews were in Rome as early as 139 B.C. and were well known to Cicero, and were still better known to the Augustan circle. Who can then assert that knowledge of prophecy in a large way was likely to be hidden? The life of Rome's underworld must always remain a secret, it is true, but we can hardly deny its existence nor fail to perceive that all our Roman historians are interested solely in the chronicles of a dominant social class. It would be marvelous if the cheap and clandestine literature had survived; it would be still more marvelous had it exerted no influence.

We are strongly inclined to believe that those Orientals, many of them, who swarmed and steamed and peddled horoscopes and trinkets and immortality up and down the Velabrum were sages compared to the noblemen we read about in Cicero, Livy, or Tacitus. We are strongly inclined to believe that Virgil was in touch with this fertile life below stairs, that from the Orientals he caught the prophetic form into which he cast his epic, that he caught from them the breadth of vision that is the basis of prophecy, which none of his compeers ever seized. It seems attractive also to believe that, while the upper classes continued to read the *Aeneid* for generations merely as poetry, its immediate and universal popularity was due in part to its sentiments being tuned to the vibrations of hearts that could take no part in Roman polity. He was in real truth the prophet of the Gentiles. He dreamed dreams and he also saw visions. He is the father of romanticists. His mind was shaped for the reception of verities which the day in which he lived could neither understand in full nor entertain; his soul is haunted by unheard melodies, ditties of no tone, strange harmonies for which slow time had failed to find notation. He discerns a domain that he may not enter, a horizon that he may not pass. He lives and moves and has his being, not in the glory of the classic sunset, but in the radiant twilight of the modern dawn—

The spirit of the years to come  
Yearning to mix himself with life.

## DID HOMER HAVE AN *ODYSSEY* IN MIND WHILE COMPOSING THE *ILIAD*?

BY JOHN A. SCOTT  
Northwestern University

No one can read the *Iliad* and doubt that Achilles was the hero of that poem; others may rise to temporary prominence, but he was the first Greek named by the poet and also the last, while even the brief success achieved by the Trojans was only a part of the plan of Zeus by which Achilles was to receive greater honor. When Achilles was on the field the others were dwarfed or entirely ignored, so that in the last five books, with the exception of the *Games in Honor of Patroclus*, he was practically the only Greek mentioned.

Yet despite all the greatness of Achilles the poet of the *Iliad* was able to create and individualize as well as glorify other heroic actors. While giving this peculiar distinction to Achilles, did the poet so bring out the greatness and the glory of Odysseus as to warrant the belief that he was preparing him for the supreme character in a later and companion poem? Did the Odysseus of the *Iliad* seem to have been formed with a view to the part he was to play in the *Odyssey*? My answer to these questions is thus: The poet of the *Iliad* when he composed that poem had no intention of making Odysseus the leading hero of an epic, and so accordingly the *Odyssey* was an afterthought.

Odysseus was not one of the two or three outstanding actors of the *Iliad*, and he was far from being a rival of Achilles, for his subordination was shown by the fact that Achilles was named directly 364 times and was named by means of his patronymic or its equivalent 135 times, while Odysseus was named directly but 120 times and by the dignifying patronymic but 8 times. Next to Achilles Agamemnon was mentioned most frequently, having been named directly and by patronymic about 300 times. Diomedes was named directly and by patronymic 182 times, Ajax the son of



Telamon about 150 times, and next came Menelaus and Patroclus, and then Odysseus.

The glory of Patroclus was so brief and the references to him were so involved with the glory given to Achilles that he hardly deserved this high rank in himself; also Menelaus by reason of the fact that he was the brother of Agamemnon and husband of Helen was named beyond his own deserts as a warrior or leader. Thus in order of their own merit the rank on the basis of number of times mentioned was Achilles first, then Agamemnon, then Diomedes, then Ajax, and then Odysseus. Agamemnon had a certain glory which was due to his office and not to his personal prowess, and although he ranked second by the test of direct mention by name or by patronymic it was clearly the purpose of the poet to give the second place to Ajax, for his ships were drawn up on the shore at one end of the battle line while those of Achilles were drawn up at the other:

Α 7: ἡμὲν ἐπ' Αἴαντος κλισίας Τελαμωνιάδαο  
ἡδ' ἐπ' Ἀχιλλῆος, τοί ρ' ἔσχατα νῆας εἰσας  
εἶρυσαν, ἡγορέη πίσυνοι καὶ κάρτει χειρῶν.

The poet definitely assigned to him the first place after Achilles, for, when Achilles was angry, he says:

B 768: ἀνδρῶν αὖ μέγ' ἄριστος ἦν Τελαμώνιος Αἴας.  
P 279: Αἴας, ὃς περὶ μὲν εἶδος, περὶ δ' ἔργα τέτυκτο  
τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν μετ' ἀμύμονα Πηλεΐωνα.

Ajax was the one called upon in times of greatest need to meet Hector, to defend the ships, and to rescue the body of Patroclus, and he alone of the fighters of the first rank was unwounded and did not withdraw from the battle. When Agamemnon inspected the ranks of the Greeks before they began the first day's fighting it was the eagerness and promptness of Ajax which especially encouraged him. When the Greeks were challenged to select a champion to meet Hector in single combat their first prayer was that the choice might fall on Ajax (H 179).

It was no doubt the great merit of Ajax as an individual fighter which induced the Greeks to send him on the *Embassy to Achilles*, a mission for which he was peculiarly ill-fitted. Those who wrote the superscriptions for the books of the *Iliad* gave an *ἀριστεία* to

Diomede, Agamemnon, Menelaus, and an equivalent to Patroclus, but no such honor to Ajax; yet his defense of the ships and the body of Patroclus deserved that distinction. Ajax was constantly called upon to meet Hector and, except for short periods when Diomede, Agamemnon, and others appear, he was always in the thick of the fight, except, of course, when entirely eclipsed by Achilles. He seemed to have been no favorite of the poet, and despite his great strength he was not allowed the honor of a single victory in the *Games*.

Diomede was the especial object of the poet's esteem, the ideal of modest yet unhesitating valor. A peculiar badge of honor is the fact that he was referred to by his patronymic far more than by his own name. When he spoke he always won applause or favor, and next to Ajax he was the one most called upon to meet the champion of the Trojans; he was repeatedly referred to as the "best of the Achaeans"; his wife was named (E 412); his ancestry and the glories of his birth were given in great detail (Σ 115 ff.); he was much beloved and favored by Athena; he won the chariot race, and he also took the prize in the spear fight. Diomede was the only prominent actor of the *Iliad* who continually showed valor, discretion, and ability. There can be little doubt that in those qualities which win and hold respect he was hardly second to Achilles himself, and if we did not know of the *Odyssey*, yet knew that a hero of the *Iliad* had been selected for a subsequent poem, we should certainly guess that Diomede was being prepared for that high honor. Diomede was the last of the Greek heroes to be introduced in the *Iliad*, as he was not mentioned until B 406, and he was wounded early in A, so that his career was both brief and brilliant, since he definitely retired from the combat as the result of that wound. This wounding was a most clever device of the poet to keep his stage free from too many actors of the first rank, for, had Diomede and Ajax both been fighting, Hector could never have forced the struggle at the ships and Patroclus would have had no occasion to join in the battles. The wounding of Agamemnon and Diomede was evidently due to the necessity of temporarily removing from the scene a couple of superfluous and high-grade warriors, and just as soon as they could come on the scene, without

crowding, their wounds were forgotten. The wounds then were devices of temporary expediency and were ignored when their poetic purpose had been served.

Odysseus as a warrior ranked well below Achilles, Ajax, Diomedes, and Agamemnon, and this was clearly expressed by the prayer of the Greeks when the lots were cast by which their champion to meet Hector was to be selected:

H 179: Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἢ Αἴαντα λαχεῖν, ἢ Τυδείδης υἱόν,  
ἢ αὐτὸν βασιλῆα πολυχρύσειο Μυκῆνης.

We do not know who the next choice might have been, but this at least we do know, that the name of Odysseus was not in their prayers. Odysseus was the one great figure of the *Odyssey* and dominated all parts of that poem, the scenes from which he was absent no less than those in which he appeared, so that it is hard to properly appraise the Odysseus of the *Iliad* without giving to him some of the importance which is his in the later poem. Achilles was no more heroic throughout the *Iliad* than Odysseus was in the *Odyssey*, where he was so easily first that it was essentially a poem of one man and was so announced by Homer in the very first word of the poem, *ἄνδρα*. Homer when composing the *Iliad* clearly had no idea of using Odysseus as the great hero of a later poem, as is shown by the following minute but significant facts:

1. When the Greeks prayed to Zeus that the lot might fall on a worthy champion, they prayed that it might fall on Ajax, or Diomedes, or on Agamemnon, but they did not mention Odysseus (H 179).
2. The two points of danger in the camp, that is, the positions at the ends, were held by Ajax and Achilles because of their great strength, while the ships of Odysseus were drawn up at the center, that is, at the place of greatest safety (Θ 222, Λ 5).
3. Odysseus never came in contact with any of the leaders of the Trojans, such as Hector, Aeneas, Sarpedon, Glaucus, nor with any but obscure and unknown warriors.
4. Ajax was called the best of men, as was Agamemnon, while Diomedes was repeatedly called the best of the Achaeans, and a similar honor was given to Patroclus, but no such honor was

ever given to Odysseus, except once when he shared it with Diomedes, of whom it is a favorite expression (K 539).

5. When Andromache warned Hector of the danger that the walls at a certain spot might be forced or scaled by the best of the Greeks, she named either Ajax, Idomeneus, Agamemnon, Menelaus, and Diomedes, but did not mention Odysseus.

Z 435: τρὶς γὰρ τῇγ' ἐλθόντες ἐπειρήσανθ' οἱ ἄριστοι  
ἀμφ' Αἴαντε δύνω καὶ ἀγακλυτὸν Ἴδομενεῖα  
ἥδ' ἀμφ' Ἀτρεΐδης καὶ Τυδέος ἄλκιμον υἱόν.

6. When Hector drew the sad picture of his wife in bondage drawing water or plying the loom, he said:

Z 456: καὶ κεν ἐν Ἀργεὶ εἰῶσα πρὸς ἄλλης ἱστὸν ὑφαίνουσι,  
καὶ κεν ὕδωρ φορέουσιν Μεσσηνίδος ἥ Ὑπερείης,

Wherever these two last places may be situated, one thing is clear at least, and that is that it never entered the fears of Hector that Odysseus would be in any position to take the kingly spoils or that the women of the royal palace would fall to him.

7. In the *Games in Honor of Patroclus* Odysseus had a draw with Ajax in wrestling, but that was due to a mean trick he played on that strong but unsophisticated warrior. Odysseus won the foot race, but not on his merits, for Ajax the son of Oileus was in the lead and would have won had he not slipped in the filth of the slain oxen. The Odysseus who appeared before the Phaeacians and who boasted of such superior athletic abilities would scarcely have been honored by the draw in wrestling or the victory in running which came to him in the games of the *Iliad*.

8. The Trojans repeatedly expressed their fears or took precautions against Achilles, Agamemnon, Ajax, Patroclus, and Diomedes, but no Trojan ever mentioned the skill or prowess of Odysseus, and in fact no one of the enemy ever mentioned his name outside of the *Teichoskopia* in Book iii except Socus, who wounded him so severely that he was forced to withdraw from the battle. If the captives of the Trojans later said among themselves that Odysseus had injured them more than any of the enemy and if because of their complaints the prize of valor was given to him,

then they conversed in tones not anticipated by the poet of the *Iliad* and for which he clearly was not preparing the hearer.

9. When Agamemnon came to Odysseus in the *Eripoleis* he gave him a most severe arraignment:

Δ 339: καὶ σύ, κακοῖσι δόλοισι κεκασμένε, κερδαλεόφρον,  
τίπτε καταπτώσσοντες ἀφέστατε, μένετε δ' ἄλλους;

347: νῦν δὲ φίλος χ' ὀρώπτε καὶ εἰ δέκα πύργοι Ἀχαιῶν  
ἡμείων προπάρειθε μαχοίατο νηλεὲς χαλκῷ.

The sting in this is much sharpened by the fact that each of the three generals whom he had just met was the subject of the greatest praise, for he said to Idomeneus, vs. 257, "Idomeneus, I honor thee beyond all the swift-steeded Danians"; to Ajax, vs. 290, "If all had thy spirit, then the city of Priam would quickly fall"; and to Nestor, vs. 313, "Would that thy limbs had the vigour of thy spirit."

10. Odysseus withdrew from the field when he saw Hector approaching (E 679), and in a later scene, despite the urgings of Diomedes, he fled, leaving Nestor with his wounded horse to face the foe. This scene is so much in point that I quote it:

Θ 92: Διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη, πολυμήχαν' Ὀδυσσεῦ,  
πῇ φεύγεις μετὰ νῶτα βαλὼν, κακὸς ὥς ἐν ὁμίλῳ;  
μὴ τίς τοι φεύγοντι μεταφρένῃ ἐν δόρῳ πῆξῃ;  
ἀλλὰ μὲν, ὅφρα γέροντος ἀπώσομεν ἄγριον ἄνδρα.  
ὥς ἔφατ'; οὐδ' ἐσάκουσε πολίτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς,  
ἀλλὰ παρήμεινε κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν.

It is clear that Odysseus was thoroughly frightened, for in the rally that took place a little later the poet described the return to battle as follows: "Diomedes led the way, then the two sons of Atreus, next to them both the Ajaxes, then Idomeneus and his servant Meriones, then Eurypylus, and as ninth Teucer joined," but Odysseus was not in this group.

11. When Agamemnon invited the leaders of the Greeks to share in the sacrifice and the feast he invited them in the following order (B 405): Nestor, Idomeneus, either Ajax, Diomedes, and sixth Odysseus, but Menelaus came uninvited; so that Odysseus was the last to be invited by the king. When the Greeks volun-



teered to meet Hector in single combat they volunteered in this order: Agamemnon, Diomedes, either Ajax, Idomeneus, Meriones, Eurypylus, Thoas, and last of all Odysseus (H 161). And even in K when Nestor asked who would offer to go and spy on the Trojans it was Diomedes and not Odysseus who presented himself, and when Diomedes asked for someone to join him in this enterprise they responded in this order: either Ajax, Meriones, a son of Nestor, Menelaus, and last of all Odysseus.

12. Often the poet introduced the exploits of a hero with some such a phrase as the following:

Ξ 508: ἴσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχονσαι,

Π 692: ἐνθα τίνα πρῶτον, τίνα δ' ὕστατον ἐξενάριξας.

Such verses were used before describing the exploits of Agamemnon, Hector, Ajax, Patroclus, and Teucer, but they were never, even remotely, connected with the deeds of Odysseus.

13. The poet very often stressed the greatness of the deed of some hero by saying that it was quite beyond the powers of men of the present time οἱοι νῦν βροτοὶ εἰσιν. This phrase was used in regard to Diomedes, Ajax, Hector, and Aeneas, but it was never used in connection with anything done by Odysseus.

14. Odysseus showed his skill in the presence of the Phaeacians by his ability to hurl the discus, yet he never presented himself as a competitor in the hurling contest at the *Games in Honor of Patroclus*, but the real and final proof that Homer had no notion of an *Odyssey* when he composed the *Iliad* is shown in the matter of the bow. The entire plot at the close of Odysseus' adventures depended on his skill with that weapon, and Homer prepared the hearers of the *Odyssey* for that contest by having Odysseus boast of his skill in archery in the presence of the Phaeacians, for to them he says:

θ 215: εὖ μὲν τόξον οἶδα εὐξοῖν ἀμφαφάσθαι·  
 πρῶτός κ' ἄνδρα βάλοιμι διστεύσας ἐν ὀμφῃ,  
 οἷος δὴ με Φιλοκτήτης ἀπεκαίνυντο τόξῳ  
 δῆμῳ ἐνὶ Τρώων, ὅτε τοξαζοίμεθ' Ἀχαιοί.  
 τῶν δ' ἄλλων ἐμέ φημι πολὺν προφερέστερον εἶναι.

Yet this man who boasted to be the best archer of all the Greeks save only Philoctetes never attempted to win the prize for archery

in the one great chance he had in the *Iliad*, that is, at the *Games*. This one proof, even if taken alone, shows that the poet of the *Iliad* was not anticipating nor preparing for that boast of Odysseus.

All these little points named above, when combined, prove that the poet or creator of the *Iliad* had no notion of preparing Odysseus for the great part he was to play in a later poem.

The wife of Odysseus, Penelope, was never named in the *Iliad* either by the poet or by the hero himself; Odysseus never referred to his native Ithaca and he never mentioned his father.

Both the positive and the negative proofs show that the *Odyssey* was an afterthought. We can hardly doubt that the creation of the *Iliad* brought to Homer great renown, so great that he decided to try his hand on another poem to be connected with the Trojan War; but he hardly cared to compete with himself in another war poem with its descriptions of battles, so hard to diversify; so he selected a poem of adventures by land and by sea. Two heroes of the *Iliad* were best adapted for such a poem, Diomedes and Odysseus, and the choice probably fell on Odysseus from the fact that he was so clever in his mind, and especially because he was from the remote and rugged island of Ithaca and thus in a peculiar sense a child of the sea.

The description of Odysseus as given to Priam by Helen from the walls of Troy,

Γ 200: οὗτος δ' αὖ Λαερτιάδης, πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς,  
ὃς τράφη ἐν δῆμῳ Ἰθάκης κραναῆς περ ἐούσης  
εἰδὼς παντοίους τε δόλους καὶ μῆδεα πυκνά

his own references to his son, Telemachus, the fact that he was a marked favorite of Athena, and that he was also able under all conditions to think shrewdly and to act promptly, all these were characteristic of the hero of the *Odyssey*, but it was a difficult task for Homer to take the Odysseus of the *Iliad*, with the limitations named above, and make the hearers already familiar with the *Iliad* believe that he was a hero of the very first rank, hardly less heroic than Achilles himself. And it was just this necessity of preparing the hearers for the new rôle which Odysseus was to play that made Homer give so long an introduction to the *Odyssey*, since over two

thousand verses are devoted to prepare the way for the entrance of the hero.

Odysseus was not a free invention of the poet, but a part of epic tradition, since he was early called in the *Iliad* "the city-sacker," and as the *Iliad* itself furnished no justification nor explanation of that epithet it is probable that it originated before Homer. All the essential qualities of the Odysseus of the *Iliad* were retained in the *Odyssey*, but they were so magnified and so glorified that the hero of the *Odyssey* is essentially a new creation.

In the foregoing study I have not mentioned the many and obvious virtues of Odysseus in the *Iliad*; all that I have attempted to do is to show that the outlines of the *Odyssey* did not take shape side by side with those of the *Iliad*, and that the many failures of the poet to mention or to exalt Odysseus prove clearly that when composing the *Iliad* Homer had no intention of making Odysseus act the leading part in a companion poem. The *Odyssey* was plainly an afterthought.

I doubt very much if those who first heard the introduction of the *Odyssey* had any notion who the hero was to be until Ithaca was named in vs. 18, and then only vaguely until Odysseus himself was named in vs. 21. The poet brought Achilles on at once in the action of the *Iliad*, but he did not choose to bring Odysseus on the scene of the *Odyssey* until he had devoted more than four books to preparing the mind of the hearer for his reception, or until that hearer had learned from the mouths of gods and heroes the superlative excellences of Odysseus himself. It has been hard for me to grasp the motive which led the poet to give so extensive an introduction to the *Odyssey*, but now I see that it was to prepare the audience for the new and exalted part which Odysseus was to play. All this is not the creation of tradition but of a supreme and original genius.

## PASTORAL ELEMENTS IN THE GREEK EPIGRAM

BY CHARLES E. WHITMORE  
Harvard University

If we define the pastoral spirit in literature as the more or less realistic presentation of rustic human nature in a setting of natural scenery we must admit that the pastoral elements in the Greek epigram are on the whole decidedly incidental, and that the number of epigrams which can be called strictly and essentially pastoral is strikingly small. The reason for this state of affairs, which can be distinguished with considerable clearness, not only illuminates the general history of the pastoral but also helps to accentuate the value of those poems in which the true pastoral spirit appears.

Though the epigram had, during the fifth and fourth centuries, made itself an independent artistic form it yet remained close to the inscriptional type in which it had arisen, and the epitaph and the dedication still controlled it almost exclusively. The latter admitted touches of natural description which, one might think, would have tended, in the numerous epigrams which describe the dedications of common folk, to introduce occasional pastoral motives; or further, when in the third century the epigram became a recognized form for the expression of every variety of thought and emotion, it might have been expected to follow a noteworthy tendency of the age and to express a purely pastoral content.

The dedicatory epigram of the Alexandrian age, however, under the lead of Leonidas of Tarentum, became a form which, though it frequently dealt with the dedication by ordinary persons of the implements of their daily toil, prided itself on gaining its effects by as few means as possible, and had no desire to bring itself too close to actual life by any very realistic touches, so that the numerous dedicatory epigrams which concern, for instance, hunters, farmers, or fishers remain pure studies in technical dexterity, with no pastoral affiliations. A token of this is the striking lack of names associated with the pastoral, which would have furnished so obvious a means of introducing an idyllic tone. In the epigrams

addressed to Pan, who as god of Arcadia might be expected to attract to himself any floating "Arcadian" suggestions, if indeed such existed, we find him chiefly addressed as the patron of hunters; in time he becomes a mere double of Priapus, a guardian of vines (*A.P.* ix. 249) or a beekeeper (ix. 226);<sup>1</sup> and by the late Roman period the hunting theme has become a subject for the mockery of Lucilius (xi. 194).

The love epigram, in its great expansion during the Alexandrian period, is also independent of the pastoral, but for different reasons. The intense passion of Asclepiades or Meleager uttered itself directly and had no desire to veil itself in a pastoral garb or setting. Scarcely an allusion to pastoral motives can be found in the extant epigrams of the kind; when Callimachus (xii. 150) uses Polyphemus to point an exhortation to a beloved youth the giant is no more than an ordinary mythological reference; when Meleager (v. 139) swears by Arcadian Pan in praise of a song it is with the general thought of the god's power in music, and has no relation to sentimental shepherds or perambulating *βουκόλοι*; and by the time Straton (xii. 203) refers to a chain of loves the motive must have been much too worn to convey any touch of pastoral affiliation. The sepulchral epigram, too, as one might expect, furnishes little for our purpose; in the epitaph of Diotimus (vii. 173) on a herdsman killed by lightning the emphasis is much more on the strange manner of death than on the rural setting, which is essentially incidental. The anonymous epitaph (vii. 717) on the old beekeeper has, however, a true pastoral tone in its picture of the deserted hives and the glades that mourn for their old neighbor:

Νηιάδες καὶ ψυχρὰ βοαῦλια τὰτα μελίσσαις  
 αἶμον ἐπ' εἰαρινὴν λέξατε νισσομέναις  
 Ὡς ὁ γέρων Λεύκιππος ἐπ' ἀρσιπόδεσσι λαγωῖς  
 ἔφθιτο χειμερὶν νυκτὶ λοχησάμενος,  
 Σμήνεια δ' οὐκέτι οἱ κομέειν φίλον· αἱ δὲ τὸν ἄκρης  
 γείτονα ποιμένα πολλὰ ποθοῦσι νάπαι.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> All references are to the *Palatine Anthology* unless otherwise noted.

<sup>2</sup> "Naiads and chill cattle pastures tell the bees as they fare on their springtide way how old Leucippus, as he sought to trap nimble hares, perished on a winter night; no longer is the tending of hives dear to him, but the pastoral dells long sorely for their neighbor of the height."



It is by way of the epigrams descriptive of natural scenery that we shall best approach those in which the true pastoral spirit becomes manifest, and we shall find the first noteworthy examples in the work of Anyte, who gives to her delicate appreciation of natural beauties an exquisiteness of rendering which Theocritus himself cannot surpass. Beginning with the simple observation of the things of daily life she describes children playing with a goat near a temple, under the indulgent eye of its divinity (vi. 312); her sympathy with the humbler living things leads her to write epitaphs for a dolphin cast up on the shore (vii. 215), or the pet cicada of some girl friend (vii. 190). A finer art is seen in the more detailed landscapes, such as that of the temple of Aphrodite by the seashore (ix. 144), or the windy orchard with its statue of Hermes (ix. 314). All this, however, scarcely justifies Reizenstein in calling these poems "rein bukolisch," if that term is to retain any specific meaning. But to one epigram it may truthfully be applied, the beautiful quatrain in the Planudean appendix, 231:

Τίπτε κατ' οἰόβατον, Πὰν ἀγρότα, δάσκιον ὕλαν  
 ἤμενος, ἀδυβόα τῷδε κρέκεις δόνακι;  
 Ὅφρα μοι ἐρσήεντα κατ' οὔρεα ταῦτα νέμονται  
 πόρτιες, ἡῦκόμων δρεπτόμεναι σταχύων.<sup>1</sup>

Even here, however, it is rather the general pastoral spirit that we recognize, as it were a poetic vision of the power that inspires the pastoral muse, than any explicit pastoral motive; not till the Theocritean epigrams do we find such a motive definitely appearing.

In this little group of six epigrams we have something unique in the history of the form. Not all are of equal importance; the first is merely a dedication, distinguished from the majority of its class by the fresh touch in some of its details. With the second and third, however, the figure of Daphnis brings us into the true pastoral atmosphere; he appears as the ideal shepherd, dedicating to Pan the reeds on which he made his rustic music, or asleep in a cave, and sought by Pan and Priapus. In the fifth we find him

<sup>1</sup> "Why, Pan the hunter, amid the lonely shadowy wood dost thou sit, making music on this sweetly crying reed?—That along these dewy mountains my heifers may graze, cropping the fair-tressed corn."

joining in the concert which is to rob Pan of his slumber; and here at last the essence of the pastoral spirit comes to perfect utterance:

Ἀῆς ποτὶ τὰν Μοισᾶν διδύμοις αὐλοῦσιν αἶψαι  
 ἀδύ τί μοι; κῆγ' ὦ πακτίδ' αἰράμενος  
 Ἄρξ' εὐμαί τι κρίκειν· ὁ δὲ βωκόλος ἄμμιγα θελξεί  
 Δάφνης καρδοτέφ' πνεύματι μελπόμενος·  
 Ἐγγὺς δὲ στάντες λασιαύχενος ἔνδοθεν ἄντρον  
 Πᾶνα τὸν αἰγυβάταν ὀρφανίσωμες ὕπνου.<sup>1</sup>

The sixth (which, *pace* Wilamowitz, is not "ejusdem generis atque V") gives a more realistic picture of the herdsman whose favorite kid has been carried away by a wolf, but with a certain sentimental tinge which perhaps inclines us to regard it as not genuinely Theocritean. But the three already referred to give a unique concentration of the essence of pastoral song, one which for perfection of workmanship and freshness of touch remains elsewhere unrivaled.

From such later examples as we find the freshness has largely departed. The figure of Daphnis remains as the type of beauty, of rustic beauty indeed, in an epigram of Meleager (xii. 128) in which his fairness is not yet lost; but the poor epigram of Eratosthenes (vi. 78) makes of him a mere conventional personage, combining the power of song with unhappiness in love; and with Macedonius he has become—significantly—aged, though he keeps the power of song. With Glaucus he leaves a love-message for Pan, cut in proper pastoral fashion on the bark of a tree, in an epigram that is not without charm. Of the epigrams which show more incidental pastoral touches, however, little need be said; for they belong to a period in which the growing taste for the rhetorical and the bizarre leads to the choice of such subjects as the man who had but a single heifer and sheep and lost even these (ix. 149, 150, 225), or bulls drawing a ship (ix. 274, 299, 347), in which the presentation of the conceit is the only reason for the poem's existence. Perhaps some of the talent which might have produced a genuine cattle piece

<sup>1</sup> "Wilt thou for the Muses' sake play me something sweet on the twin flutes? and I, lifting the harp, will begin to stir the strings; and the herdsman Daphnis will mingle the spell with music of the wax-bound breath of the pipe. Thus standing near within the shaggy cave, will we rob of his sleep Pan, the lord of the goats."

expended itself in the series of epigrams on Myron's bronze cow! The work of Erycius, who seems to have written not long before Vergil, has a certain pastoral tone, but one which is after all not developed, even in the direction of the artificial; a dedication to the Pans of Arcadia (vi. 108) is a simple prayer for wealth in flocks, with no "Arcadian" suggestion whatever. Another (vi. 96), in which pastoral names appear, is in contrast with what we have noted as the practice of the Alexandrian epigram, but its Glaucon and Corydon, *Ἀρκαδες ἀμφοτέρωι*, are obviously direct borrowings from Theocritus, with no independent vitality. Finally, the collapse of the pastoral under the dominance of the erotic element is typified in the epigram of Myrinus (vii. 703) in which Thyrsis, the shepherd of the nymphs, falls asleep under a pine, while Love takes his crook and watches the flocks. Here is "Arcadia," if one will, and an index of how far the epigram has traveled from the simplicity and directness of an earlier period.

It is the evanescence of the pastoral which results most markedly from this brief investigation. We have the premonitions in Anyte and the perfect little group from Theocritus; in Meleager's time we have delicate touches in the work of Zonas, and the more explicit references in Erycius; later, in the first century after Christ, come fainter echoes in Satyrus, echoes that are almost inaudibly prolonged to the very close of the Byzantine period, when the couplet of Cometas (ix. 586)—a vain prayer!—forms the epitaph of Greek pastoral poetry:

Πᾶν φίλε, πήκτιδα μίμνε τεοῖς ἐπὶ χειλεσι σύρων,  
Ἦχ' ὃ γὰρ δῆεις τοῖσδ' ἐνὶ θελοπέδοις.<sup>1</sup>

In the great collection of the *Palatine Anthology* the epigram with definitely pastoral content is even more incidental than the Alexandrian bucolic poetry in the literary history of Greece at large.

<sup>1</sup> "Dear Pan, abide here, drawing the pipe over thy lips, for thou wilt find Echo on these sunny greens."

## Notes

[Contributions in the form of notes or discussions should be sent to John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.]

### ON SUBJUNCTIVE CONDITIONS

In the paper entitled "The Analysis and Interpretation of Conditional Statements" by R. B. Steele, in the February issue of the *Classical Journal*, there occurs one statement that seems to me entirely erroneous. It is not essential to the writer's argument, and the error, therefore, in no way invalidates his conclusions. He says, on page 354, "As both the Latin and the English use the pluperfect to express the past unreal condition, an imperfect tense for the present, and a present tense for the less vivid future (ideal), examples from both languages may serve equally well," etc. This statement is very evidently not true for less vivid future conditional sentences in English. In these the conclusion always has "should" or "would," as with present unreal conditions, while the condition may be expressed in three ways, e.g., "What would you say if he asked you to go?" or "if he should ask you," or "if he were to ask you." All these forms are very clearly *past*, not present.

The forms of contrary-to-fact conditional complexes in such modern languages as English, French, Spanish, and German, as well as in Greek and Latin, all indicate a past future origin. "He was going to help me if he was to be here" came rather easily to mean "he would be helping me if he were here," and similarly "had been going to help" came to mean "he would have helped." Logically there is nothing to prevent a past future expression from referring either to the actual past, or present, or future, i.e., with reference to the time of utterance. The difference between these sentences in Latin and in the modern languages is that the past future expressions in Latin never refer to time later than the actual present, while in English, French, Spanish, and German they are also used to refer to the actual future in the less vivid form.

In French, Spanish, and German there is no formal distinction whatever between present contrary-to-fact and less vivid future conditional sentences. In English there is more discrimination, for we have one word, "were," that is used, either as an independent verb or with the present participle of another verb, to express a present contrary-to-fact notion but not a less vivid future. On the other hand the word "should" and the phrase "were to" are used for the less vivid future but not for the present contrary to fact. If the condition, however, has a simple past tense the sentence may belong to either class according to the meaning of the verbs or the context. The following sentences will illustrate:

1. If he were here he would help.
2. If he were helping us we should need no others.

3. If you knew the facts better you would realize the danger.
4. If he asked you that question, what would you answer?
5. If he were to ask you, etc.
6. If he should ask you, etc.

The first three are present contrary to fact; the last three, less vivid future. The third and fourth are alike in form, but the time is clearly indicated in each case by the meaning of the words.

The theory of a future force inherent in the Latin subjunctive has great value as a working hypothesis in explaining the tenses of the three regular subjunctive conditions, each form indicating a time one stage in advance of the tense used, the present tense referring to future time, the imperfect to present time, and the pluperfect to simple past time. Moreover, a recognition of the past future origin of contrary-to-fact conditional complexes helps very much to clarify and co-ordinate the somewhat various and complicate forms that are found in their conclusions. We find there not only those forms that are clearly past future, such as the combination of the future active or future passive participle with *erat*, *fuit*, *fuert*, and *fuisse*, but also the imperfect and perfect indicative and the perfect infinitive of many verbs and expressions of futurity, like *possum*, *debeo*, and *aequum est*.

It may also be noted here that the conclusions of contrary-to-fact conditions may or may not be themselves contrary to fact, although they are so classified by most grammars and other textbooks, either by direct statement or by definite implication. What would have happened if certain things had happened differently from what they did may or may not be what actually did happen. Adversative conclusions, for example, are always, from their very meaning, in accordance with the fact, not contrary to it. "I should have done what I did even if you had not asked me." An interrogative conclusion, likewise, from its very nature cannot be contrary to fact. "What would you have done if he had said this to you?" Sometimes the contrary notion applies to a part only of the conclusion. In this passage from *Cat. iii. 17*, *non ille (Catilina) nobis Saturnalia constituisset*, the clause as a whole is not contrary to fact, for the deciding upon the Saturnalia was the act, not of Catiline, but of the other conspirators.

BERNARD M. ALLEN

PHILLIPS ACADEMY  
ANDOVER, MASS.

---

## TWO CORRECTIONS

Mr. Walter Leaf asks us to make the following statement in correction of his note in the October, 1917, issue of the *Journal*:

"In my note on Mr. Maury's interesting paper there is an unfortunate mistake on page 67, line 24, 'they were not conditioned by physical circumstances.' I meant to say 'they were not unconditioned by physical circum-



stances.' The meaning is just the opposite of what I meant. Of course Greek sailors, like all others, were conditioned by physical circumstances."

In Professor Bassett's note in the April number, page 529, lines 4-6 should read:

in her place Hermes as "god of the machine," and Circe and the shade of Tiresias to give Odysseus the information which is important both for him and for the hearer.

---

#### LINCOLN AND GORGAS ONCE MORE

May I add a brief addendum to Professor DeWitt's supplement to my article on "Lincoln and Gorgias." There are today a hundred thousand ministers of the gospel in the English-speaking world who are quite as familiar with the Bible as Lincoln was. These men have almost daily practice in public speaking and in writing the king's English. Yet somehow not one of them has succeeded in attaining Lincoln's distinction in literary style, a distinction due in no small measure to an exquisite use of figurative language. There are in the English-speaking world a hundred thousand lawyers who are quite as familiar as Lincoln was with the refined diction of Blackstone and with all the formulas of the law. Not one of them has written or could write a letter of such a weighty and monumental character as was Lincoln's letter to Horace Greeley, August 22, 1862. I still think I am at least partially right when I speak of Lincoln's "divine intuition." Perhaps it would have been more fortunate if I had spoken of his divine instinct for the right word and right phrase, or of his "pure taste by right divine."

It is an easy and convenient assumption, that a man never gets out of his head any more than he has put into it. For most of us this may be true. But when we attempt to explain human progress this assumption gives us real difficulty. Where did Gorgias get his figures? Perhaps from Heracleitus and other predecessors. But where did Heracleitus get them? And so we trace the matter back to Adam, and according to our assumption we must say that the first man not only possessed potentially but actually exhibited as well all the refinements of literary style and of the other arts that characterize our present civilization. And so the account of the Garden of Eden, recorded in the early chapters of Genesis, meets with confirmation from an unexpected source. There are some weak-minded latitudinarians, however, who still prefer the doctrine of the divine immanence.

CHARLES N. SMILEY

GRINNELL COLLEGE

## Recent Books

Foreign books in this list may be obtained of Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 West 27th St., New York City; G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-55 West 25th St., New York City; F. C. Stechert Co., 29-35 West 32d St., New York City.

- BUTLER, L. T. *Exercises in Latin Versification*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon. 12mo, pp. 7+149. \$0.75.
- CUDWORTH, W. H. *The Odes and the Secular Hymn of Horace*. Englished into rimed verse corresponding to the original meters. New York: A. A. Knopf. Pp. 20+161. \$1.50 net.
- FOWLER, W. W. *Aeneas at the Site of Rome*. Observations on the eighth book of the *Aeneid*. New York: Longmans. Pp. 9+128. \$1.50 net.
- FREEMAN, C. E. *Selections from Ovid*. Edited with introduction, notes, and vocabulary. (Junior Latin Series.) New York: Oxford University Press. Pp. 128. \$0.50.
- . *Vergil's Fourth Aeneid*. Edited with introduction, notes, and vocabulary. (Junior Latin Series.) New York: Oxford University Press. Pp. 107. \$0.50.
- . *Titi Livi Ab Urbe Condita, Liber I*. Edited with introduction, notes, and vocabulary. (Junior Latin Series.) New York: Oxford University Press. Pp. 198. \$0.50.
- HURLBURT, S. A., and BRADLEY, B. W. *Handbook for First-Year Latin Vocabulary*. New York: American Book Co. Pp. 45. Paper, \$0.24.
- . *A Notebook for First-Year Latin Vocabulary*. New York: American Book Co. Pp. 96. \$0.24.
- KING, J. R. *Ciceronis Pro Lege Manilia Sive de Imperio Cn. Pompei Oratio*. Edited by John R. King. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Cr. 8vo, pp. 91. 2s. 6d.
- MERRILL, W. A. *Lucreti De Rerum Natura*. Recognovit Guilelmus Augustus Merrill. Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press. Pp. 258. \$2.50.
- PERKINS, A. S. *Beginning Latin Book*. Boston: Benj. H. Sanborn & Co. Pp. xxii+432.
- SHIELDS, EMILY L. *The Cults of Lesbos*. Menasha, Wis.: G. Banta. 8vo, pp. 18+100. Paper, \$1.00 net.

# Classical Association OF THE Middle West and South

## Officers of the Association

### President

CAMPBELL BONNER  
THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

### First Vice-President

LOURA B. WOODRUFF  
OAK PARK, ILLINOIS, HIGH SCHOOL

### Secretary-Treasurer

LOUIS E. LORD  
OBERLIN COLLEGE, OBERLIN, OHIO

### Vice-Presidents for the States

ALABAMA	HORTENSE THORNTON,	BIRMINGHAM
ARKANSAS	GUY A. SIMMONS,	CONWAY
COLORADO	CHARLES C. MIEROW,	COLORADO SPRINGS
FLORIDA	JOSIAH B. GAME,	TALLAHASSEE
GEORGIA	E. K. TURNER,	OXFORD
ILLINOIS	LOURA WOODRUFF	OAK PARK
INDIANA	FRANK H. COWLES,	CRAWFORDSVILLE
IOWA	F. C. EASTMAN,	IOWA CITY
KANSAS	O. G. MARKHAM,	BALDWIN
KENTUCKY	M. A. LEIPER,	BOWLING GREEN
LOUISIANA	EDWARD A. BECHTEL,	NEW ORLEANS
MICHIGAN	CHEEVER HOYT,	DETROIT
MINNESOTA	ARTHUR L. KEITH,	NORTHFIELD
MISSISSIPPI	ALFRED W. MILDEN,	UNIVERSITY
MISSOURI	H. H. ARMSTRONG,	SPRINGFIELD
NEBRASKA	SUSAN PAXSON,	OMAHA
N. CAROLINA	HELEN H. LAW,	RALEIGH
N. DAKOTA	GUY R. VOWLES,	FARGO
NEW MEXICO	LYNN B. MITCHELL,	ALBUQUERQUE
OHIO	EDWIN L. FINDLEY,	CLEVELAND
OKLAHOMA	O. W. JEFFRIES,	EDMOND
S. CAROLINA	MINNIE A. GEE,	SPARTANBURG
S. DAKOTA	J. H. HOWARD,	VERMILION
TENNESSEE	DAVID R. LEE,	KNOXVILLE
TEXAS	DANIEL A. PENICK,	AUSTIN
UTAH	ALICE E. ROWE,	SALT LAKE CITY
VIRGINIA	HERBERT C. LIPSCOMB,	LYNCHBURG
WEST VIRGINIA	CHARLES E. BISHOP,	MORGANTOWN
WISCONSIN	LUCIA SPOONER,	SUPERIOR
WYOMING	IDA B. HULL,	SHERIDAN

### Executive Committee

THE PRESIDENT, FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT, SECRETARY-TREASURER,  
AND

WILLIAM G. HALE  
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, CHICAGO, ILL.  
CHARLES LITTLE  
NASHVILLE, TENN.

A. L. BONDURANT  
THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI, UNIVERSITY, MISS.  
J. B. PIKE  
THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

# The Classical Association of the Middle West and South

is organized for the purpose of encouraging the development of the study of the classics; to provide a means of intercommunication between teachers of the classics—whether in the secondary schools, in the colleges, or in the universities of the territory it covers; and generally to promote a unity of thought and action in the broad field of classical teaching. Membership in the Association is open to all teachers of the classics and to other individuals interested in classical studies who reside in the territory covered by the Association. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year; \$1.25 of this amount covers the subscription to the *Classical Journal*, which is a special rate, the regular subscription price being \$2.50 per year. The value of the *Journal*, which is the official publication of the Association, to those interested in the classics, either as students or as teachers, cannot be measured by the annual outlay. The advantages involved in this offer should therefore appeal strongly to those who find themselves in this class.

Application for membership in the Association should be made to the Vice-President of the state in which the applicant resides (see list on page three of cover), or to the Secretary-Treasurer of the Association.

A plan of co-operation has been perfected with the Classical Association of New England and the Classical Association of the Pacific States. See second cover-page for directions relating to applications for membership.